THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12. MARCH, 1933. Vol. XXII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

An Australian Heresy Hunt.

The Afrikanders have just concluded their Heresy Hunt and have deprived of his official position their only great Biblical scholar, Professor du Plessis.

The Australians, or at least we hope a very limited section of them, are now engaged in a similar effort in the case of their most notable theological scholar, Dr. Angus, Professor of Theology in St. Andrew's College, of the University of Sydney.

St. Andrew's College is a Presbyterian foundation, and of course Dr. Angus himself is a member of the Presbyterian communion. He is also a suburban pastor. He is well known in this country on account of his great book, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World*—a volume as admirable for its sound judgment as for its erudition.*

The Presbyterians in Great Britain are characterized by an enlightened use of modern methods and modern research in Biblical studies, though, it must be confessed, only as the outcome of trying for heresy a number of their most notable leaders. Unfortunately Presbyterians abroad are much behind their co-religionists in this country. It would be perhaps unfair to place the Presbyterians abroad on the level of the American fundamentalists of Dayton in Tennessee, but it will suffice to

* Published by John Murray, price 15/- (1929).

say that the results of modern Biblical research are largely unknown to them, and their theology, although it has dropped the calvinistic predestinarianism satirized by Bobbie Burns in 'Holy Willy's Prayer,' is yet strongly traditionalist in a pedestrian way. Bishop Butler pronounced ignorance to be a lower form of vice, but colonial Presbyterians, especially their laity, should not be too severely condemned. To pass from the old faith to the new is no easy matter, even for men of learning and leisure, and for those who have little of either it is a matter of intense difficulty. They wish, and they have good reason to wish, to hold the Faith of their Fathers, and they do not know how to do it except by holding it in their Fathers' way.

The establishment of a modern faculty of theology and Biblical studies in each of the great Dominions, staffed by men as erudite and courageous as they were reasonable and reverent might, if all candidates for the ministry were compelled to sit at their feet, do much to enable the laity to exchange the old faith for the new. These faculties, however, can hardly be said to exist at all, and professors of pre-eminently first-class intellectual ability and spiritual leadership are equally non-existent.

Yet, there are exceptions to every rule, and Professor Angus is such an exception. But his fate, strange as it may seem to those who do not understand the ways of ecclesiasticism, is, after years of loyal devotion to duty, to be called upon by a considerable section of his co-religionists to resign his professorship and his pastorate as one who is betraying the Christian Faith. The usual argument which makes such a forcible appeal to a commercially-minded community is reiterated with force and fluency. We cite a passage from the Dominion Press which presents it succinctly:

> The professor is paid a salary as preacher and teacher on the understanding that he expounds certain doctrines in a certain way. If he has ceased to accept these doctrines in the sense in which he professed to interpret them when he received these appointments, there can be only one course open to him—he should cease to make a living out of them.

Of course this argument assumes that the Professor or Pastor is appointed, not to teach the truth, but to repeat a tradition. Yet, if the Christian religion be pre-eminently the religion of the Spirit of Truth, which is ever striving to lead the disciples of

Jesus into all truth, such a view of the Christian teacher's functions is really blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

The main charge against Dr. Angus is concerned with his views on the mission, martyrdom and divinity of Jesus. These views have given dire offence and are declared not to be 'in harmony with the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church.' His views, which have been suspect for years, were summarized in a recent address entitled, 'What is Christianity?' The address caused an outburst of protest on the part of the more conservative members of his denomination. In the *Sydney Morning Herald* of November 9th, 1932, the Professor thus explains his teaching on that occasion :

> By way of introduction I referred briefly to the difference between the early Jewish-Christian apocalyptic expectations and our modern Christian outlook on the world and on history. I then sketched the character of the religion of immediacy taught and lived by Jesus, and the contrasts in some respects between Jesus' pronounced ethical religion of fruit-bearing and that of historic Christianity.
>
> 'I pleaded that Christianity should be judged by Jesus rather than Jesus by Christianity. Then I presented Christianity positively as above all else Christ-likeness in motive and character; as the witness of the Spirit of God with our spirits that we are God's sons; as the development of filial consciousness in communion with God and fellowship with Jesus; as the bringing of all the ambitions and yearnings of life into "the obedience of Christ"; as a vitalising faith based on the unseen and eternal realities whereby is attained "the victory that overcometh the world"; as the constant striving to attain "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" in the service of One Who "is not ashamed to call us brothers."
>
> 'I pointed out that Christians are more healthily occupied in determining whether they themselves measure up to the fulness of Christ than in deciding whether others are in their judgment Christians; that Christians to-day, whether they like it or not, are judged not by their beliefs, but by their lives; not by the opinions they profess to hold, but by what they are and do, and in the constant application of the stern canon, "if any man has not Christ's Spirit he is not Christ's, whatever else his qualifications may be."
>
> 'I then pleaded for toleration and perspective in regard to Church membership, creeds, politics and all the divisive things that set Church against Church and Christian against Christian, and that distract the minds of Christian people from the active service of the Kingdom. I concluded by appealing to Paul's wise and practical entreaty, "Become ye imitators of God as beloved sons and make love the principle of your lives."'

To modern-minded students, whether of the New Testament or of our present-day needs and conditions, this will seem eminently sane and wholesome Christian teaching.

The charge that Dr. Angus does not believe in the Divinity of Jesus was well met by the retort of one of his sympathisers, the Rev. N. C. Goss, that he (Dr. Angus) did believe in the Divinity of Jesus, but in a much broader and deeper way than did his opponents.

Another Presbyterian minister, the Rev. George Cowie, defended the Professor on the ground that the Church ought to give its professors and pastors freedom both of thought and expression.

Another Modernist Creed.

The following significant letter dealing with a well-conceived and well-executed project was published in *The Christian World* of February 9th, 1933:

Sir, A Re-statement of Christian Thought.

During the May meeting week last year a conference was called at the Blackheath Congregational Church to consider the need for a re-statement of Christian thought and the discovery of a technique of the Christian life, which should take into account the changes demanded by the knowledge and issues of our day.

All who were present at the conference were agreed on the need for this, and at the close it was arranged that those present who lived in London should form a group to work out a possible statement of Christian belief, which could be commended as worthy of acceptance.

This group has been meeting at regular intervals and has reached certain conclusions, which it would now share with others. Without claiming to be in any way exhaustive or final, the group believes that the following statement conserves the essential values of the Christian heritage in a form which the Church can recommend without reserve to the thoughtful men and women of our day, and which will open a door of faith for many who cannot accept the traditional expression of the Christian message.

Signed on behalf of the group:

H. E. A. Condon.
J. C. Harris.
A. G. Knott.
F. Lenwood.
K. A. Saunders.
T. Wigley.

We believe that God may be apprehended through all the common and normal endowments of our nature as human beings. It is obvious that multitudes of seeking souls have in all ages come into a personal awareness and experience of God independently of, and sometimes in defiance of, stated intellectual conceptions, transmitted creeds, or traditional beliefs.

1. We believe in God, who through the ages has given Himself in ever fuller revelation to men, as in response to the promptings of His spirit they have become more able to receive Him.

2. We believe that in all the goodness of men He makes Himself known, and especially in Jesus.

3. We believe that this involves :

(*a*) The recognition that God's purpose for the world is to express the divine love and holiness in both individual and corporate life.

(*b*) A discipleship which consists in loving God and men as Jesus did, and in striving to establish the same relations with them at any cost.

(*c*) The certainty that the same divine power which was available for Jesus is available for all men.

(*d*) A continuous endeavour to achieve and maintain fellowship with God in thought, meditation and prayer.

4. We believe that this is the path of sonship, but if those who have turned aside will commit themselves to the unchanging love of God, they will find forgiveness and renewal of fellowship.

5. We believe that spiritual fellowship cannot be severed by physical death.

6. We believe that the Church is a fellowship of the followers of Jesus, in which men unite:

(*a*) To worship God and discover His will.

(*b*) To share their experience with one another.

(*c*) To transmit their inheritance to generation after generation.

(*d*) To establish His Kingdom on earth in all their relationships, international, economic, social and personal.

It is not a new dogmatic creed which makes salvation dependent upon holding right views which is needed at the present, but a declaration of the kind made by this Congregationalist group of Modernists which combines right doing with right thinking. We congratulate them heartily on their courage, clear-headedness and breadth of vision, and we venture to hope that the Congregationalists, who are among the most modernist of the Christian Communions, will as a body follow their notable lead.

The Christian Spirit versus the Canon Law— A Layman's Plea.

'The ears of the laity are more sacred than the tongues of the clergy,' so wrote an ancient Father of the Church in a period of ecclesiastical controversy, and in this age we have not infrequent examples of the pens of the laity being more sacred than the pronouncements of the clergy. The following letter contributed to the *Times* by the Chief Justice of Burma (Sir

Arthur Page) on February 18th is one of those documents which deserves for its sanity and sapience to be read more than once.

SIR,

When a controversy between ecclesiastics becomes acute it sometimes happens that the wood is lost sight of because of the trees. That is what is happening now over the inter-Communion resolution passed by the Episcopal Synod at Calcutta in February, 1932. Perhaps it may help if a layman, greatly daring, tries to restore a sense of perspective. The Synod received the request of the S.I.U. and Wesleyan Churches that in the meeting of the joint committees and in conferences organized directly by it the members should be at liberty to unite in a Communion service presided over by ministers of one or other of the Uniting Churches. It is urged that the omission of this final act of fellowship is a serious stumbling-block to the negotiations, and that if such united Communions were made possible the success of the negotiations would be materially advanced.

The Synod felt that 'there do come occasions in great spiritual movements when the presence of God's spirit is realized in a very special measure,' and resolved that, though the Synod is unable formally to endorse the procedure asked for because the matter is one on which the Church of this Province has not yet reached a common mind, a majority of the Synod is unwilling to limit the liberty of the delegation in this matter, or to call in question the action of any who feel impelled, in view of the agreement already reached and in confident expectation that full agreement will be attained, to join in the Lord's Supper celebrated by ministers of the other Uniting Churches at meetings of the joint committe and retreats organized directly by it.

Thereupon, on March 20, 1932, certain Anglo-Catholic divines issued a manifesto in which, among other things, it was observed that 'the proposed procedure constituted in principle a clear violation of Catholic order,' and that 'if at any stage such violation were formally endorsed, we should no longer be in a position to advise an Anglican priest to continue to minister in the Church of India.' And in June, 1932, the Bishop of Colombo exclaimed, 'What kind of Church is to be set up in South India? Is it in actual fact to be a Church in which priesthood is repudiated, Catholic order held in light esteem, and all ministries are equated? If so, I for one shall be obliged sorrowfully to record my vote against it.'

FACTS IN PERSPECTIVE.

To many laymen like myself it seems that the discussion on this resolution has been allowed to get out of hand, and it is time that the matter should be put in its true setting. The late Lord Collins, a distinguished scholar and devoted Churchman, when Master of the Rolls, used to say that rules and regulations were intended to be the handmaid and not the mistress of the law. If the present controversy were permitted to affect the prospect of Christian union among the Churches in South India it would mean that a matter of procedure only has been allowed to imperil the success of one of the greatest movements towards Christian unity that the world has ever known. For it is a rule of procedure and nothing else over which the trouble has arisen. The founder of Christianity in His infinite wisdom refrained from laying down any rules by which the sacrament of Communion was to be regulated, and never at any time directed, or even suggested, that the

Communion was to be 'celebrated' by any particular person or classes of person. Nor was the practice of the early Church in this matter either prescribed or uniform. As was pointed out by an authoritative body of Churchmen in June, 1930:

The claim that a particular pattern of ministry was necessary to the gift of God's grace in the sacraments was formulated later and defined to safeguard the official ministry of the Church, just as a dogma of verbal inspiration was propounded to safeguard the canonical Scriptures. These dogmas, perhaps natural under earlier conditions of thought and life, cannot to-day be maintained, and in particular it is impossible as it is impious to deny reality to the sacraments of non-episcopal ministries.

Indeed, Bishop Gore himself conceded that the ministration of the sacraments solely by episcopally ordained priests is not the *esse* but the *de bene esse* of the Catholic Church and doctrine. On the other hand, from the second century onwards it has been the rule of the Church that the Communion should be 'celebrated' solely by priests ordained by duly consecrated Bishops. The Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon has expressly affirmed the validity of this practice (see declaration 5 of its constitution), and it is not to be contemplated that so fundamental a rule should be departed from except on a special occasion or for a special purpose.

For these reasons—and they are not, and cannot be, gainsaid—it becomes obvious that this matter, which has raised so much controversy, related to a rule of procedure only, though a rule of fundamental importance, devised and prescribed by human lawgivers, and not by divine mandate from the founder of Christianity. It is concerned with tradition and not with truth. But truth is greater than tradition, and it cannot, I think, reasonably be contended that any tradition, however venerable, or any law propounded by human lawgivers, whoever they may be, *ex necessitate rei* is, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, always to be followed, and never to be departed from, whatever the circumstances or the occasion may be. So to hold would be to ascribe to mortal men the infinite wisdom that belongs to the Deity alone

An Immutable Rule?

It matters not, as it seems to me, whether the resolution of the Synod can be brought within the ambit of the canon law relating to 'dispensation' or 'economy'; if it does, *cadit quaestio,* if it does not, and the resolution rings true, the principles of ecclesiastical or canon law must be broadened to meet the new conditions that have arisen. Those of us who are concerned with the administration of Oriental systems of law refuse to be bound for ever by the rules of law laid down centuries ago by Manu in India or the authors of the Dhammathats in Burma, and as well in customary as in canon law truth newly revealed as the years pass by may demand a reconsideration even of age-long rules and traditions.

I am, of course, aware that in the opinion of many Churchmen the due performance of certain rules of ceremonial procedure savours of, if it does not merge in, the substance of Christian doctrine, and that therein lies the gravamen of their objection to the resolution of the Synod. But *magna est veritas et praevalere debet,* and looked at reasonably and broadly what is it of which complaint is made?

The seamless robe of Christ has been rent, and our unhappy divisions are such that a Brahmin said to a friend of mine in India, 'I wish to become a Christian, but what am I to be? I am told that I must join the Roman Catholic Church, or the Church of England, or the Wesleyans, or the Baptists, or any one among the many other Churches, but is there not a Church of Christ?' The South India Church movement means that in South India Christians stand for harmony and not discord, and are willing to sacrifice much that they prize most highly if only thereby the rent may be repaired and unity achieved.

In these circumstances what is it that they ask and to which objection taken? Merely that during the conference the members of the joint committee may be permitted to join together in Communion presided over by a minister of one or other of the conferring Churches. Is inter-Communion on such an occasion really so mortal a sin? Viewed broadly and reasonably does it justify the outburst of Bishop Carpenter Garnier, or merit a threat of ostracism by Anglo-Catholic theologians? Apply the supreme test. What would Our Lord's reply be to such a request? Would He give it His blessing or refuse the request as involving a violation of Catholic order? Who can doubt what His answer would be? Does not the request ring true? And, if so, is a rule of canon law to be allowed to bar the way? Which is to be preferred, the sanctity of a rule of ceremonial procedure or the furtherance of the cause of Christian unity? Is it upon a rock like this that a great movement towards reunion is to be wrecked? My answer would be that every institution must have its rules and regulations, but that rules and regulations should be made to subserve and not to defeat the end for which the institution was created. If it is thought that the movement towards 'Protestant' unity will retard reunion with the Roman Catholic Church, I would reply that the one is afar off, the other is at hand. Let us 'buy up our opportunities,' and in connexion with the South India movement let us not confuse tradition with truth, or allow rules of procedure to militate against or outweigh the substance of Christian faith or doctrine.

Excessive introspection is unhealthy and engenders neurasthenia. As a journalist remarked at the Lausanne Conference, 'Christianity is still suffering from too many professors or swivel-chair Christians. I fear that some of the chairs even are not swivel-chairs, but are screwed to the floor.'

Let us not look in too much, but out and forward and up, leaving the dead past to bury its dead, and reaching forward with high hopes and brave hearts to meet the new problems of a rapidly changing world. Let Christians regain a sense of proportion, and, still refusing to abate one jot or tittle of the essentials of the Christian faith, let us not rigidly retain our formularies at any cost, or allow the rules of procedure laid down by the canon law to become the masters and not the servants of the Church.

Your obedient servant,

Themis Court, Rangoon. ARTHUR PAGE.
January 22nd, 1933.

We recognize in this contribution to the South India controversy the expression of a statesmanlike mind as reverent as

it is reasonable. We fear, however, it will make no impression on the clerical mind, which is so much the child of tradition both in belief and practice that it is unable to support any policy by which historic institutions are adjusted to new conditions. It is to be hoped that the South India scheme is not going to provide a battlefield for arid Church controversy during the next thirty years, which is we believe the period required for this scheme's consummation. It is unfortunately the case that where open resistance is inadvisable or impossible the ecclesiastic falls back on the diplomatic methods of the Turks, and hopes by means of interminable discussions to weary his opponents either into subjection or into indifference. It must be confessed that this policy usually succeeds, although, as a consequence, the cause for which the Church stands and the Institutions which it defends, lose vitality and influence.

How the World sees the Church.

The following paragraph from the *Sphere* of February 4th, 1933, is significant:

> 'The Church Convocation of Canterbury rejected a resolution supporting the opening of cinemas on Sundays, and brushed aside a proposal that the Church should advise on courtship, marriage, and parenthood, but agreed to petition Parliament to restore the name of King Charles I (the *Martyr*) to the Prayer Book Calendar.

Of course the *Sphere* does not represent the world in any very mundane sense, nor does the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury represent the Church in any very comprehensive sense; nevertheless the *Sphere* does represent the practical good sense of the educated Englishman, and Convocation does represent the mind of a number of worthy clerics, the majority of whom seem to be living in ecclesiastical backwaters. King Charles the Martyr, whom these worthies wish to commemorate, and the no less martyred Archbishop Laud, very nearly succeeded by their injudicious zeal in extinguishing their beloved Church of England, and led Clarendon when commenting on the Laudian policy to remark that 'Churchmen [*i.e.* clerics] were of all educated men the worst judges of public affairs.'

THE BARTHIAN MOVEMENT AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION*

By A. C. Bouquet, D.D., Stanton Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Cambridge, Hulsean Lecturer, 1925.

IF the task of philosophy be to give a coherent explanation of the whole of the universe, then the task of the philosophy of religion must be to give a coherent explanation of the whole of what is subsumed under the head of religion. During the first quarter of this century such study became specially recognized in our universities. Lectures dealing with it were endowed, and at Cambridge a section of the Theological Tripos was devoted to it. More and more it came to be felt that the criticism of the text of the Bible could not in itself establish the validity of the Christian religion in particular, much less of religion in general. It was found necessary to explore the evidence available as to man's physical ancestry, the various theories relating to con sciousness and knowledge, the data provided by non-Christian as well as Christian systems of belief and practice, and the traditional arguments for the nature and existence of Deity. The scope of the research engaged in by members of divinity faculties here and elsewhere has become in consequence immensely widened, and it may fairly be said that the interest of their work has very much increased.

There is, however, one all important question which has to be decided in advance before any really satisfactory conclusion can be arrived at on the subject of the philosophy of religion, and that is the place which should be given in it to the idea of a divine initiative. I happened to attend the course given by the first Stanton Lecturer in 1906, and I do not remember that that question was seriously raised by him. I think it was taken for granted that there was such a thing as revelation, and that for the purposes of study the traditional division into natural and revealed religion might be accepted. But obviously the matter could not rest there. Professor Gwatkin had already begun his

* A paper read before the University Theological Society at Cambridge, October 27th, 1932.

Gifford Lectures with the words: 'All knowledge is in some sense revelation,' and when in 1905 the volume called *Cambridge Theological Essays* appeared, it was found to contain an essay by that noble patriarch, James Maurice Wilson, which was in effect an expansion of Gwatkin's thesis, and which maintained that revelation and discovery were two aspects of the same reality, and that just as discovery is progressive and yet sometimes also saltatory, so the self-revelation of Deity is progressive and yet discontinuous, suddenly advancing to its zenith in Christ.

Twenty-seven years have rolled by since that essay was published, and in the interval the post-war period has swamped us with an orgy of discovery. All but a mere fraction of teachers and students in our universities are engaged in work which presupposes man's ability to find out almost anything that he wants by his own exertions, and it has come to be assumed not merely that human reason is capable of the task, but also that it can really be accomplished, if only a student, given the proper amount of intelligence, combines it with strict impartiality, with patience and with entire absence of prejudice. No creed, no principle, no statement of alleged natural law can under such conditions be regarded as more than a working hypothesis, and there is no suggestion that finality must or may contain any element of givenness which is super-rational, or any deposit of truth laid down in some dim distant past. Moreover, all investigation appears to start from the point of the human observer.

The effects of this scientific outlook are writ plain over our religious studies. Whether rightly or wrongly, the whole of the material of religious experience has come to be scrutinized in precisely the same way as that in which scientific students scrutinize historical archives, or the past and present remains of biological species. In some ways this demand for impartiality has no doubt been a clear gain, but it is not quite unfair to suggest that the very strictness of its method has led it to stray from impartiality into prejudice. It has allowed itself to adopt the pre-supposition that where revelation is claimed, it is almost safe to assume that that claim is mistaken, and to adopt the prejudice that what is put forth as a *deus dixit* is only a misperception of a *homo invenit*. We are forbidden (it seems) to pre-suppose the

idea of revelation, and we are told to treat the record of all religion without exception as the record of the past and present reaction of the *hominidae* to the whole of the reality, but never the record of the recoil of reality upon the *hominidae*.

We might almost paraphrase the remark of Alciphron in one of Berkeley's dialogues by substituting in it the word 'revelation' for that of 'grace':

> 'At the request of a philosophical friend I did cast an eye on the writings he showed me of some divines, and talked with others upon the subject, but after all I had read or heard I could make nothing of it, having always found whenever I laid aside the word in question and looked into my mind, a perfect vacuity or privation of ideas. And as I am apt to think men's minds and faculties are made much alike, I suspect that other men, if they examined what they call revelation with the same exactness and indifference, would agree with me that there was nothing in it but an empty name.'

At the moment the study of the philosophy of religion has reached an acute crisis upon this point. The general tendency of the study from its inception has been to make its peace with the scientific temperament. As long ago as the middle of the last century Charles Darwin wrote in one of his letters, 'In my judgment there never has been a revelation.' Another writer, quoted by J. M. Wilson, implies much the same thing when he says, 'All religions are made by men and there is no revelation.' Julian Huxley is therefore true to type when he calls his excursion into theology 'Religion without Revelation.' Indeed, if we talk to any young scientist to-day we shall find that the most he is prepared to conceive is that the history of religion is the history of the discovery of God by man through a process of trial and error, sometimes undertaken by persons of meagre intellect and at other times by individuals possessing rare insight, and among these he will perhaps be prepared to place Jesus of Nazareth at the head. A good many scientists, however, will not commit themselves as far as this, and while they treat the accumulated evidence of religious belief and practice as of great interest for the student of humanity, they will not allow that it has come to any valid conclusions. It is with persons such as these that the exponent of the philosophy of religion has been seeking to deal, and he has tried to learn from them, both in the matter of method and in single-minded devotion to the pursuit of truth.

It would seem that in the reconstruction of our attitude towards the theory of religion we are presented with three alternatives: (1) We may construct our philosophy on the assumption that religion is an entirely human activity and that its results are probably false. In that case our work will become a branch of archaeology. (2) We may construct a philosophy of religion which regards the latter as human theorizing and investigation yielding approximate truth. In that case our work will be a branch of sociology. (3) We may regard religion as entirely a matter of human investigation and yet hold that, in spite of error and failure, real discovery has been made and that some form of religious belief is therefore true.

Nevertheless, a really strict impartiality in studying the data of the world's religions should preclude anyone from ruling out the category of revelation as inadmissible. By all means let us examine the data as though we had never seen them before and try to put ourselves in the position of persons who do not know what they are going to find; but if we do so let us at least be fair, and let us be ready for anything that may come along, and hesitate to reject it, when we see it, merely because it is unexpected. If we do this, it seems certain that we are bound to admit the possibility of constructing a philosophy of religion which not only accepts the category of revelation, but which goes even further, and places the revelation associated with the historical Jesus in the centre of its picture.

I said above that at the moment the study of the philosophy of religion had reached an acute crisis, and it might be thought that the crisis was solely due to the intransigeance of the scientists who refused to admit even so much as discovery. This, however, is not the case. The crisis comes from the other side, *i.e.* from a revived emphasis upon the complete givenness of revelation. Hitherto what we may call for convenience sake a Wilsonian theory of revelation has been the common meeting ground for scientists and theologians. The terms of it have been stated in various ways. Sometimes it has been suggested that revelation is like the unveiling of a statue. The revealer is the person who draws away the sheet, but at the time the statue reveals itself by being there to be viewed. At other times the picture is that of a number of different people working at re-

search upon a difficult and obscure subject and finding out as they go first one and then another piece of knowledge, so that the synthesis advances along with the research. This, however, is regarded by the new champions of revelation as a mere paltering with a dangerous situation. The group of thinkers who are perhaps not very happily designated Barthian, regard theories of the Wilsonian type as worse than useless. Karl Barth and his associates hold that what we need is not a philosophy of religion at all but a theology, and not necessarily a philosophical theology (since that is beyond our powers), but a theology which completely repudiates the idea that man can on his side construct an adequate, coherent and all-embracing system. This sounds like a very proper protest, and indeed not a very new one. The warning that once we have got a complete system we have got God Himself, Absolute Truth, and that that is impossible, since all our finite apprehension must be relative, that only God can know God, only God can speak of God — all this looks like an alternative way of saying 'Un dieu défini est un dieu fini.' It is not new, and most sensible philosophical theologians have recognized it from the beginning, and have known very well that in this life we can only expect to get a partial approximation to the truth about God.

Of course it is possible to say, as a learned Congregationalist did at the Bristol Congress in September, that the Barthian theology is reactionary and has no future. At the same time, it seems hardly wise to dismiss so hastily a movement which is held to have captured more than half the theological students in Germany, and which is transforming the whole outlook of Protestant theology in many parts of Europe. The matter must be discussed, and surely it should be discussed in all places where students of science and of theology congregate, and not least in a faculty where the last composite utterance included, as I have already observed, a theory about revelation of a type which would be totally rejected by Barth. We are apt to regard Barth, because of his thundering paradoxes and his talk of tangents and circles, as more of a novelty than he really is. In a certain sense, though a Reformed theologian, he is proclaiming old-fashioned Lutheranism, in that he declares, with Luther, that there is no way up from man to God — 'Man darf nicht in die

Majestät Gottes hinaufklettern,' as Luther says. (The same sentiment may be found in the writings of the modern Scandinavian theologian, Professor Nygren, and also in those of Emil Brunner, a colleague of Barth's, who says 'No road leads back, not even through mystic inspiration, from man to God.') But more than this, Barth and his associates are seeking to think through again the category of revelation, and in this they are only doing what, in their own way, certain British theologians have been trying to do for some time. I need only mention H. R. Mackintosh, Archbishop Temple the younger, Father Leslie Thornton and Canon Oliver Quick. All these lie on the same side of the line as Barth, different as they are from him in other respects, for they aim at constructing a philosophical theory which will treat religion as more than a process of discovery which is the reverse side of revelation, and at retaining the idea of the latter as an act of Deity coming into the cosmic series *ab extra*, and doing so *once for all*. Beyond this, however, there is little likeness, since Barth's doctrine of his absolute qualitative difference between Deity and humanity separates him from Romans and Anglicans alike. Both are for him dangerously impregnated with the sweet poison of titanism.

Now plainly this is a very serious matter. It is all to the good that we should be called upon to re-think the category of revelation. But it is most alarming to find the whole of the efforts which have been made during the past thirty years to construct a *modus vivendi* between science and religion treated as entirely mistaken, and it is still more alarming to find that the new champions of revelation have no notion of meeting the men of science on their own ground and respecting their religious devotion to the pursuit of truth, but are on the contrary flinging at them, in a manner which seems to imply 'take it or leave it,' a doctrine of man which is abhorrent to the most sober anthropologists, and an affirmation about revelation which disparages and even insults reason. In seeking to establish revelation as an *a priori* category, they declare it 'vertical,' and insist on treating it as something which has no connexion with active human discovery, but drives like a lightning flash into the midst of our feeble, puzzled and exhausted humanity, whose only possible reaction can be that of 'Gehorsam,' or obedience.

I venture to suggest, however, that we should hesitate and consider our grounds very carefully before we abandon, even in a modified form, what we may call for convenience the Wilsonian type of revelation-theory, though I imagine there are few who would agree to it without modification. Granted, we ought to do justice to the possibility of revelation being discontinuous; we run, as it seems to me, a real danger in isolating the so-called strange new world of the Bible from the world as it is known, let us say, to nine-tenths of the membership of our universities. Let me suggest four considerations.

(1) Is it not possible that the state of tension indicated is very largely due to a subjective difference over the doctrine of man? The distrust of discovery and the forlorn flight to revelation are plainly due to a failure of nerve not unlike that which Professor Gilbert Murray declares to have overtaken the Greek spirit in late antiquity. It is sometimes said that the Anglo-Saxon is a Pelagian and the German a believer in irresistible grace, but Gogarten is obviously right in rejecting this and in pointing out what we know as a commonplace — that British Evangelicalism has certainly been anything but Pelagian, while German idealism probably was. Is it not a question of mood? In our black moments we speak of fallen humanity, of a ruined world, and of our unhappy situation; but is it safe to construct a doctrine of man upon the basis of changing moods? Not long since Mrs. Rhys-Davids wrote in the *Hibbert Journal*: 'Conviction of sin is Semitico-Aryan, it is not equally Indo-Aryan. We must just set it down to temperament and mood.'

Many years ago when I was a curate in South London, a well-known American evangelist came and preached in Lambeth and began his address with some such words as these: 'A great sorrow has come into the heart of God; one of his planets has become prodigal. Hush your voice, for ours is that prodigal planet.' There are doubtless some who will say that such a doctrine can perfectly well be fitted on to the Jeans-Eddington cosmogony, and that experience confirms it; but if so, then we are to confess ourselves wholly and forever in a pathological condition, and if that is really the case, then plainly we ought to doubt not merely our confidence as human beings to engage in *any* useful research, but also whether, even if there were such a

thing as an intrusionary descent of God into this cock-pit of misery, we should under the circumstances be capable of recognizing it. Is it not better and more in accordance with the facts as we know them to say that man, with all his wilfulness, his many departures and perversions, his times of pride and rebellion, his eros, his titanism, is nevertheless the child of God, struggling upward, divinely guided, feebly and sometimes blindly co-operating with his Maker, yet displaying even within his imperfect life much of the divine glory? Should we not say with a former Lady Margaret Professor, 'Sin is a privation, a defect, and it does not touch the core of man's being, the grounds of his soul. There is in all of us a divine spark which can never consent to sin.' It is not man's pathological condition that is the chief thing about him, but his glorious possibilities. By all means let us avoid the pride which goeth before a fall, yet not by rushing to the opposite extreme of despairing pessimism.

(2) But now, in the second place, let me point out what on the other side seems lacking in the modern view of the universe. What it lacks is the idea that Deity comes first. Thinkers like Julian Huxley, when they talk about their self-existent universe, never seem to face fairly what is meant by 'self-existence' or by 'the universe.' They overlook the fact that every detail in the cosmic process which unveils itself before us bears the marks of contingency, so that if there be that which is self-existent it must be the *Whole*, within which and possibly as part of which the cosmic process is unfolded; and such a Whole is what the philosophical theologian means by Deity, in whom we live and move and have our being. 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, etc.' *God comes first*, and hence His self-expression is prior to all His creatures and to their discovery of Him and of His ways. It is therefore impossible for man to discover God without God having revealed the possibility of His being discovered. The life of God is logically prior to and inclusive of the lives of all His creatures, and it is not dependent upon them.[1]

[1] Emil Brunner, in his most recent work on Ethics, *Das Gebot und die Ordnungen*, has some useful remarks upon the contrast between Science as 'Gehorsam,' *i.e.* obedient response to the will of God, who desires that His purposes and activities in the cosmos shall be discovered, and Science as arrogant and rebellious self-assertion.

(3) But thirdly, the word revelation itself seems to be employed in two different senses by those who make use of it. First, it is used as the equivalent of willingness to be known, putting oneself in the position of being discovered. Plainly, in this sense, discovery and revelation may be (as Wilson says they are) opposite sides of the same thing, and we are able to think of revelation in the way we have already mentioned, as like the unveiling of a statue by someone who pulls the sheet away from it and uncovers it to the public gaze. In this case, of course, the statue reveals itself by being there. We are also able to think of revelation as resembling the unfolding of a landscape to a man who climbs a mountain and sees the whole prospect extending itself beneath his feet and changing in its proportions as he makes the ascent, although it is not the landscape that moves, but he himself. There is, however, a wholly different sense in which the word revelation is used, namely, as representing the divine initiative, and it is in relation to this that the Wilsonian theory, as it seems to me, requires modification. It is said, and it is said quite rightly, that in speaking of Deity we are speaking, not of something which is motionless or inert like a statue or a landscape, but of a living and changing and moving entity, not of course like a man, but at any rate not sub-personal. Now initiative certainly means more than mere willingness to let oneself be known, and revelation in the sense of initiative is not the obverse of discovery. Hence there is a case to be made out for the Barthian notion of 'Urgeschichte.' The latter, as I understand it, means 'God's career of discontinuous activity,' and it is not the same as the course of events in human history. History (or Geschichte), in fact, is not the record of God's career but of man's, and it only reveals God when, in the course of history, God intervenes; and that is Urgeschichte. Intervention is a discontinuity. Otherwise we should not be aware of it. In this sense 'not every time is revelation-time' (the phrase is Barth's.) Yet what are we to make of such an aphorism as that of Kagawa the Japanese evangelist, 'The entire universe is God's word,' or of the remark credited to General Gordon when he picked up the newspaper in his boys' club and said, as he opened it, 'Let us see what God is doing'? It seems clear that we must still think of the course of events as, at any rate, God's

derived activity, and of what *seem* to be interventions rather as *intensifications* of that derived activity due to discontinuity in the release of the divine energy, a discontinuity *within* the Being of God Himself,[2] so that the relation of actual revelation (in the sense of initiative) to man's discovery of God will be a fluctuating ratio between divine and human activity, and will be present throughout all life in varying degrees. This does not involve us in a surrender of the uniqueness (or, as it has been called, the once-for-allness) of the divine initiative in Jesus, but it admits the possibility that for other times and other purposes there may be other forms of the divine initiative, and that in neither sense of the word can revelation be said to have ceased.

(4) Finally, although we shall construct a much better theory of life if we recognize the possibility of an ever-present revelation, I am sure that those of us who are engaged in studying and teaching theology will be well advised not to under-estimate the difficulty that our pupils, who have been brought up under modern systems of education, necessarily find in working with the category of revelation at all. Discovery is to them so familiar that any other term to describe the conveyance or the acquisition of knowledge seems to them almost meaningless. I have tried to show that this need not be the case, but I do not believe that it is any use trying to convince our critics merely by shouting *Deus dixit*, without being able to give any reason for the proclamation; since apart from our single method of recognizing and reflecting upon experience, we can have no means of judging the validity of an alleged revelation, and from the human standpoint God's priority means nothing to us until we have experienced it; hence discovery must be set over against willingness to be known, against responsiveness, and even against special initiatives when they occur.

[2] Dr. Tennant's definition of revealed religion is 'God's causing Himself to be understood'; this seems to ignore the idea of such understanding involving the possible discovery that God is discontinuously active. Tennant says, 'Christ revealed God in that he *understood* Him, and has enabled us not to see *what* he saw without using the same means, but to see *as* he saw, by our own personally aided insight.' This seems inadequate. Surely in what Christ offers us there is something *more* than understanding the qualities of static deity.

CROSS-BEARING WITH CHRIST*

I.

'Whosoever will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross, and follow Me.' — *Mark* viii, 34.

IN Lent we are reminded of the obligation to tread the *via crucis*, which the Christian religion teaches to be the *via lucis*. Cross-bearing has taken many forms in the history of the Christian religion. In the Primitive Church at Jerusalem, Cross-bearing took the form of proclaiming Jesus as Messiah, betrayed and condemned by the Jewish religious leaders, and crucified by the Roman officials. For St. Paul and his fellow-workers in the Gentile mission, Cross-bearing took the form of asserting the equal standing of Jew and Gentile within the Christian Church and the refusal to recognize Jewish legalism as the necessary means of human salvation. Jewish legalism itself, so St. Paul taught, was crucified with Christ, and Paul, the legalist pupil of the Rabbis, was crucified with his Master.

When the Christian Church in the Roman Empire was competing for supremacy against the imperial worship, Cross-bearing took the form of refusal to sanction by any act the imperial *cultus* or to acknowledge as divine any of the deities of the pagan pantheons. Thus the Christian in those days, like Socrates in Athens, suffered death as an atheist in the eyes of his pagan neighbours.

In the Middle Ages, Cross-bearing took the form of enlisting in the Crusades and dying in battle against Muslims for the freedom of the Holy Sepulchre, or against Albigensian heretics in defence of orthodoxy.

In the Protestant Reformation, Cross-bearing, for not a few in Northern and Central Europe, took the form of suffering torture and a fiery death in protest against the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome 'and his detestable enormities.'

In the rival Papal camp, Cross-bearing took the form of the ascetic and missionary life in the company of Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites and Jesuits, who showed

* Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on the First Sunday in Lent, 1933, by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, D.D., F.S.A.

as great a devotion and courage as their stoutest Protestant opponents. So much for some of the most dramatic forms of Cross-bearing in Christian history.

II.

Such varied forms of Cross-bearing naturally prompt the question, What is the essential idea of Cross-bearing in the Christian religion? There seem to be four main conceptions of the Cross and its significance.

(1) The first, and in Christian history the dominant, conception of the Cross is *dogmatic*. It sees in the Cross the instrument of the expiatory sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ to the Divine Father for the sins of mankind. This conception of the Cross is very ancient. It goes back at least to St. Paul, and in a sense it goes back much further, for it is the expression of the Old Testament conception of expiatory sacrifice, a form of sacrifice vigorously condemned by all the greatest of Israel's prophets some eight centuries before Christ. It is difficult to imagine that Jesus could have viewed His death in this way, although natural enough that Christian believers, who had formerly been Jews or Pagans, should interpret His death thus. Jesus Himself seems to have shared the view of the eighth century prophets in His attitude towards the Jewish sacrificial system, as is indicated by His prediction (like that of Micah and Jeremiah) of the destruction of the Temple and His declaration of God's Will expressed in the words of Hosea:

> 'I desire loving-kindness and not sacrifice.'

We cannot doubt but that in this age-long controversy between priest and prophet on this issue Jesus was in agreement with the magnificent summary of the prophetic teaching of *Micah* vi, 6-8:

> 'Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly (the message of Amos), and to love mercy (the message of Hosea), and to walk humbly with thy God (the message of Isaiah).'

We cannot fail to observe that among the recorded sayings of Jesus there is none which expresses approval of the sacrificial

system or makes the forgiveness of sins dependent upon it. The teaching of Jesus on the forgiveness of sins is a most important element in His Gospel, but though He stresses emphatically and repeatedly the terms of Divine forgiveness, He never mentions sacrifice as one of those conditions.

Jesus suffered on the Cross in the spirit of the Servant of the Lord portrayed in *Isaiah* liii. He, the Righteous One, suffered for the unrighteous to bring them to God, but He suffered, not as an expiatory victim, but as a martyr for the truth.

(2) Closely connected with the Dogmatic Cross is the Magical Cross which St. Helena discovered at Jerusalem. Its wonder-working power plays a curious part in the Church History of the Western and Eastern empires. Its multiplied fragments procured from adoring worshippers vast gifts for the fortunate ecclesiastical foundation which possessed these sacred relics. The sign of the Cross used in exorcism and as a protection against various forms of evil belongs to the same category. Like the Dogmatic Cross, the Magical Cross is a product of a cycle of religious thought and feeling which is steadily passing into the background, and is utterly alien to the mind of the Saviour.

(3) The third conception of the Cross is *disciplinary*. It is the symbol of self-discipline, ranging from the ascetic self-inflicted sufferings of monks and nuns to the self-denial demanded for the efficient discharge of the duties of everyday life. The Cross is equated with suffering: for some this suffering is voluntary, for others inevitable, but all gain moral and spiritual strength by accepting it as the Divine lot for them and bearing it in the spirit of Jesus. Many who have been utterly unable to believe in the Expiatory Cross, have yet been firm believers in the Disciplinary Cross. We see this exemplified in the words of that noble Unitarian hymn, 'In the Cross of Christ I glory.' St. Luke by his insertion of the word 'daily' in the saying 'let him deny himself, take up his cross *daily*,' thus domesticates the Cross in the everyday life of the Christian. But whether Jesus did so is open to question. The words in *Mark* x, 21, 'Take up the Cross,' addressed to the rich young man, which are not found in the parallel passages in *Matthew* and *Luke*, are evidently not the words of Jesus, but a later expansion.

(4) The fourth conception of the Cross is *propagandist, missionary* and *edificatory*. It is, I believe, in this fourth sense that the duty of Cross-bearing is commanded by Jesus, if not by precept, at least by example. St. Paul, who is generally regarded as a great exponent of the expiatory conception of Christ's sufferings on the Cross, seems on one occasion at least to view those sufferings in this fourth sense, when he speaks to the Colossians of himself suffering on their behalf and thereby filling up that which is lacking in the sufferings of Christ for His body's sake, the Church (i, 24), teaching implicitly what Origen taught explicitly, that there are many Christs in the world.[1]

Lightfoot, when he divides Christ's sufferings on the strength of this passage into two classes, propitiatory and edificatory—the former of which it was impossible for St. Paul to fill up, for they were already completed—is the exponent of traditional theology not of sound exegesis. The sufferings of Jesus as the Christ, were of this fourth type—propagandist, missionary and edificatory. It is only in the latter days of His ministry, after He has been confessed as the Christ at Caesaria Philippi, that the Cross comes into the teaching of Jesus. In order to understand the nature of His Messiahship it becomes necessary for His disciples to realize that it leads to the Cross. But why should it lead to the Cross? It may be answered because it was God's will. But although that answer may satisfy the dogmatist, it will not satisfy the historian, who is concerned with secondary causes. Christ's Messiahship led Him to the Cross, not simply because He was the Christ, but because of the kind of Christ He was. The suffering of Christ upon the Cross, although it cannot be separated from the whole problem of suffering in the creative process, was yet something which He brought upon Himself by the way in which He chose to act. To know what that way of acting was, and to know why He so acted, supplies the specific answer to the question, why was Jesus crucified?

It was the undoubted mission of Jesus, as He saw it, to teach with Messianic authority a higher religion both morally and spiritually than was current in the Judaism of His day. That higher religion had three outstanding characteristics.

[1] *Contra Celsum*, iii, 28; Comm. on *St. John* vi, 6 (3).

1. First, it gathered up into one the most vital, universal and spiritual elements in Israel's religion. It united the universalist outlook and the profoundest ethical convictions of the great prophets: the most tender and heartfelt of the devotional experiences of the psalmist: the belief of the apocalyptists in the reality of the spiritual world and personal immortality.

2. Secondly, the religion of Jesus contains certain elements which in their content, if not always in their phraseology, are original. Of these the most outstanding are:

God as the Father of all mankind and of every individual human soul.

The supreme importance both of sincerity and simplicity in religion and in life.

The folly of worldly anxieties.

That a man's conduct and character are the true test of the quality of his religion.

That he who serves is greater than he who rules.

A new conception of blessedness.

The little child as the pattern of the citizen of the Kingdom of God.

The true nature of Prayer.

The terms of the Divine Forgiveness of Sin.

The importance of Faith in the cure of disease.

The duty of practising a human neighbourliness which recognizes no national or sectarian limitation.

A new ideal of the relations of the sexes and the spiritual equality of men and women.

The subordination of all institutions to the idea of human welfare; and last, but not least, Jesus Himself the Christ of God.

I have not ventured to include in this summary the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God, because, since the arrival of the eschatologist, we seem to know nothing more about the Kingdom than that it was a divine eruption which did not come off. If that Kingdom was apocalyptic there was nothing original in it, not even the nearness of its advent, for therein Jesus had been anticipated by John the Baptist. If I should dare to assert with the Fourth Gospel that the Kingdom is essentially moral

and mystical, and describe it by the term Eternal Life, I should be condemned by all our contemporary authorities in the interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels.[1]

3. Thirdly, the religion of Jesus, as von Harnack has pointed out, was even more remarkable for what it excluded than for what it included. Much that contemporary religious Judaism held as acceptable to God, Jesus viewed as futile and offensive. He treated with withering sarcasm the belief that the authority of moral and spiritual truth could be proved by miracles. He emphatically denied that physical disasters were divine punishments for sins. He was indifferent to fasting and ascetic practices. He ignored religious taboos which distinguished between clean and unclean foods, and He paid little regard to meticulous Sabbatarian regulations and ceremonial ablutions.

Both in what it contained, but even more by what it condemned and ignored, this religion of Jesus brought him into acute conflict with the adherents of the most influential forms of contemporary Judaism. The Essenes and their co-religionists, the disciples of John the Baptist, were disappointed by the neglect of asceticism exhibited by Jesus. He seemed to them to be a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of 'publicans and prostitutes.' The Pharisees were pained by the contempt Jesus shewed for ceremonialism, legalism and Rabbinical casuistry, and all those petty pieties and proprieties to which the disciples of the Pharisees had been taught to attach the highest importance. The Zealots hated the pacificism of Jesus and His advice to pay due regard to the demands of a foreign and pagan government. Such sayings of Jesus as

> 'They that take the sword shall perish by the sword'; 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's'; 'If a government official commandeer thee to go with him one mile, go with him twain,'

must have been as gall and wormwood to these religious fanatics. The powerful though unpopular Sadducees, the High Priestly clan, the hereditary guardians of the Temple and the administrators of its sacrificial system, Jesus wounded in the most tender part of their anatomy—their pocket.

[1] Yet when St. Paul writes to the Romans, 'The kingdom of God is not food and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,' he also is setting forth this moral and mystical conception of the kingdom (*Rom.* xiv, 17).

It was not of later Christian ages, but of His own time, Jesus uttered the words

> 'Broad is the way that leadeth unto destruction and many there be that are walking therein, but narrow is the gate and rough is the way that leadeth unto the life (*i.e.* of the Kingdom) and few there be that are finding it,'

as He observed the multitude of the adherents of these more popular religious parties, and marked the meagre little company of His own disciples.

Yet Jesus was no pessimist. He was fully assured of the future triumph of His religion — the Kingdom of God, as He called His religion, might be compared to a grain of mustard seed, the smallest of all the seeds sown in his fields by the Jewish farmer, but one which subseqeuntly produced a larger growth than all the rest.

> 'Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.'

This is a saying which may be ascribed to Him with more certainty than that dramatic utterance which concluded His trial:

> 'From now onwards ye shall see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven.'

But both these sayings proclaim the absolute conviction of Jesus in the ultimate triumph of His mission.

The superficial reader of the Gospels, delighted with their freshness, originality and simplicity, inclines to suppose that it was the religion of Jesus which attracted the multitudes. But it was not. The manner in which Jesus taught certainly did attract by its remarkable directness, authoritativeness and picturesqueness—Jesus spoke both as a poet and as a prophet. The publicans and prostitutes were attracted by His courtesy and kindness to them, so different from the contemporary practice of the religious authorities; but more influential than his manner of teaching was His reputation as a healer of the sick. He strove by every means to avoid this rôle of healer, but it was thrust upon Him. But most influential of all in its power of popular attraction was the deep underlying conviction of the multitudes that Jesus was more than a prophet, more than a healer: that He was the Messiah Himself—one who was about to inaugurate a new political and social régime and overthrow the hated tyranny of the Roman government. But the essence of His Gospel, that which makes it so attractive to the modern-minded

man, was not the cause of the popularity of Jesus. It was only, if we may say so, just in so far as the Gospel of Jesus was misunderstood that it was popular. And it is tragic to realize that this misunderstanding was not confined to his opponents or to the careless, indifferent masses in his audience, but that His chosen disciples themselves were among those who misunderstood Him. No one can read Mark's Gospel without noting the reiterated rebukes by Jesus of their lack of perception, and it was the sense of this failure to understand his Master which was perhaps for the affectionate St. Peter as poignant a memory as his threefold act of denial.

III.

The religion of Jesus, so repugnant to His religious contemporaries, so difficult of comprehension by His followers, was His Cross. Jesus was not executed because He was the Christ, but because of the kind of Christ He was. Had He been an Essene Christ, a Pharisee Christ, a Zealot Christ, a Sadducee Christ—all of them thoroughly comprehensible Christs—He might have escaped crucifixion. But He was a Christ after a different manner and of a different kind, and so He was crucified, and has been crucified afresh many times since in the course of Christian history. Had He yielded to the temptation to make His Messianic mission an economic mission, ministering to men's material needs; had He yielded to the temptation to make it a political mission intent upon building up a great military empire; had He yielded to the temptation to make it a combination of magic and mystery, of signs and wonders, He might have been a popular Christ. But He turned from them all. He would not appeal in the name of religion to men's economic needs, political ambitions, their sense of 'the numinous' *mysterium, tremendum fascinans.*

He appealed, not as some suppose, to the ecstasy and terror aroused by the imminence of an apocalyptic cataclysm, but to man's moral, spiritual and rational consciousness. But that appeal, to be heard and understood, had to force its way through a mass of taboos, prepossessions, prejudices (many of which have returned to overlay it). Any understanding student of St. Mark's Gospel will have observed with what coolness and caution, deliberateness and wisdom, He carried out His mission.

He was resolved that if possible He should not be misunderstood nor cut short before He had planted the seed in a soil in which it should germinate and come to fruition. What is called the sense of immediacy which characterizes the later period of His mission is due to His sense of His temporal limitations, the shortness of the time, the narrowing sphere of His activities, the perils of arrest and execution : there is no convincing proof that it is due to His expectation of a Divine irruptive cataclysm. But it was natural enough for primitive Jewish Christians to interpret it in this way.

Yet Jesus shrank almost as much from His mission as did Jeremiah from his. Those startling outbursts,

> 'I come to cast fire upon the earth'; 'I come to bring not peace but a sword'; 'I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it is accomplished'; 'Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the Baptism that I am baptized with?' 'Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me,'

point to a state of intense inner strain reflected also in His rebuke of St. Peter, who thought Him mad, 'Get thee behind me Satan, thou savourest not the things that be of God but those that be of men," and which are presented in a more mystical and systematized form in Q's narrative of the threefold temptation. The bitterness of the Cross was intensified by His absolute conviction of its power to save His nation could they but be persuaded to accept it :

> 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that slayest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thee as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not.'
>
> 'Woe unto thee because thou knowest not the day of thy visitation.'

In the spirit of the Suffering Servant, He bore the Cross, not to save His contemporaries — that was impossible — but to save posterity. 'He shall see the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied.'

IV.

But the Cross had to be borne, not only by Jesus, but by His disciples. That is the point. They were selected by Him — inspiring yet terrifying thought — to be, not His courtiers, not His officials, but His Cross-bearers. The Cross-bearers not of an expiatory sacrifice, but of a spiritual religion. That they were destined by Him to be Cross-bearers only dawned upon them

on that last journey up to Jerusalem, when His face was set (significant phrase) to go thither, and they, as He strode ahead, they, an amazed and terrified little band, followed behind. But though He carried the Cross through to the end, they were not equal to carrying it with Him. They all forsook Him and fled.

A modern expositor of the Gospels speculates as to the different conception we should have had of the significance of the Cross if James and John, and not two brigands, had been crucified with Jesus. Yes, and even more so if Peter and Andrew and all the apostles had been crucified there with Him. But then, like the heroes before Agammemnon, there might have been none to tell the tale.

But they, the Twelve, were not alone called upon by Jesus to bear His Cross : all who are His disciples are called upon by Him to do it. Whosoever doth not bear His Cross cannot be His disciple.

The tragedy of Christian history, as we see it, is not only that many of the disciples of Jesus have, owing to their cowardice and slackness and indifference, avoided bearing His Cross, but that so many of His disciples with splendid courage and self-sacrifice have, in obedience as they believed to Christ's call, borne crosses in His name which were not His, and by so doing have set the clock of religious progress back and 'have thereby crucified the Son of God afresh.'

The Cross that Jesus bore was the Cross which was erected for the crucifixion of One who desired to expel from His nation's religion all that was opposed to truth, freedom and love, and all that thwarted the fullness of fellowship, human and Divine.[2]

That Cross stands before mankind demanding to be borne. It voices the claim of the higher religion, the very highest upon man's loyalty and service. Men produce all sorts of reasons why they should not heed the summons of the Cross. In some cases they affirm flatly that they do not recognize the claim of any religion whatsoever on their loyalty. Whether that religion call itself higher or lower, they regard the religious life and the religious way of interpreting the universe as all hopelessly astray. When the claims of the Cross are presented to them, they, like

[2] It was the religion of Israel universalized, spiritualized, humanized, or if we will, the religion of Israel delocalized, delegalized, dematerialized, but not as later ages believed, organized, theologized, and sacramentalized.

Atheist in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, fall into a very loud laughter. The attitude of the more utilitarian adherents of this class is summed up in Gibbons' *dictum*:

> 'For the populace all religions are equally true; for the philosopher equally false; for the magistrate equally useful.'

For modern-minded men religion has no claim at all; though for people of the lower culture, 'the charcoal-burners' of humanity, it may have uses—mostly narcotic, as the Bolshevists declare. Such maintain that the cultural level of a people determines the character of its religion until that level rises high enough for the people to do without any religion at all. I believe that this attitude towards the claim of the Cross, widespread though it be to-day, is based on a false foundation, the falsity of which will in all probability only be realized by a community when it is too late to remedy it. For myself, I am convinced that it is not a civilization which determines the quality of its religion, but its religion which determines the quality of a civilization.

But there is, as it seems to me, a more subtle reason for refusing to bear the Cross that Jesus bore. There are those who are entirely satisfied with the religion of their community and have no belief at all in the call to reform it, purge it, develop it, after the example of Jesus. Some of these persons do not believe that such a reformation could be achieved. Others would not have such a reform even if it could be obtained. The first say, you have some sort of notion that you can eliminate the irrational and the immoral and the materialistic from your religion. That is absurd. It has been attempted many times, but though you drive out nature with a pitchfork, yet will she return.

> 'Naturam expellas furca
> Tamen usque recurret.'

Do you not really destroy a religion's vitality and influence in proportion as you succeed in eliminating from it immorality, superstition and materialism? Do not religions cling close to the heart of man just in so far as they possess all these things in abundant measure? It is these which provide that warm, comfortable, lowly dwelling which man demands as a religious home, if he desires a religious home at all. Like the slum child taken to spend a long summer day in the country: he was shown the horses and cows, the bees and the flowers, the poultry and the

fruit trees; he exhibited but a languid interest until he came to the pigsty, and then, drawing a deep breath of satisfaction, he said 'This do smell like 'ome.' The old myths, the ancient taboos, the archaic formularies, the primitive ceremonials, these are the essential possessions of a cherished religion. And yet one is required in the name of the Cross to purge our religion of these things. It cannot be done.

Then there are those whom, as we have said, would not do it if they could. Not a few of our apostles of contemporary culture, our poets, our artists, our votaries of modern fiction and drama, are opposed to puritanism, and they seem to hold that the beautiful is somehow inextricably united to superstitions, mythologies, false history and the lower morality, and the backward not the forward vision. If they are right, then the Cross-bearing of Jesus was a profound mistake. He ought to have acquiesced in and enjoyed with an artist's eye the religious situation of His day. He ought not to have attempted to reform it. Yet He called the religion of the Pharisees 'play-acting,' and He wished in the name of God to replace it by reality, sincerity and simplicity.

And as for those who turn from the Cross of Jesus because they refuse to believe that religion can be reformed, they have the long history of the evolution of religion against them. That evolution, it is true, has not moved forward in a straight line. Probably two helices, the second standing reversed on the apex of the first, represents the truest picture of the evolution of the religion of mankind. And for myself I see the Cross of Jesus standing at the point where the two helices touch.

History shows us how religious evolution has come about. That evolution has not been a natural process, if by this we mean an inevitable progress which the comfortable believers in have only to watch and to admire. It has been achieved by the personal, the heroic, the self-sacrificing efforts of individuals: the founders of new religions, the reformers of old religions, the prophets, the sages, the philosophers of humanity. Each of these in his day and generation, like Jesus of Nazareth, bore the Cross—the Cross of the claim of the Higher Religion against the indifference, against the blindness, against the protests, against the persecutions of the votaries of the lower religion.

At the present time and in this country it is particularly the duty of the educated classes of the nation, our University teachers, our educational authorities, to bear the Cross of Jesus. England is in grievous need of the highest form of the Christian religion, as indeed is all the world. And it is to meet this need that Cross-bearers are summoned. The objection that we have other work that we must do, that we are not personally fitted for Cross-bearing, that we have a very large class of official Cross-bearers—the bishops and the clergy—are not valid reasons for shutting our eyes to or turning our backs on the claim of the Cross in our own case. The excuses of comfortable indifference, the objections of self-satisfied scepticism, the deep misgiving lest such a difficult enterprise be in vain, the baits of ecclesiastical popularity and the wiles of the modern followers of Mr. Facing-both-ways, are not valid against the claim of the Cross.

James Russell Lowell in his noble hymn has caught the spirit and expresses for modern minds that claim of the Cross for our generation which Jesus presented some nineteen hundred years ago, and for which He died on Calvary.

By the light of burning martyrs,
Christ, thy bleeding feet we track
Toiling up new Calvaries ever
With the Cross that turns not back.

New occasions teach new duties;
Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of truth.

THE DEATH OF GEORGE TYRRELL

Jany. 1, 1909. 'If I decline the ministrations of a Roman Catholic Priest at my death-bed, it is solely because I wish to give no basis for the rumour that I made any sort of retractation of those Catholic Principles which I have defended against the Vatican heresies. If no priest will bury me, let me be buried in perfect silence. If a stone is put over me, let it state that I was a Catholic Priest, and bear the usual emblematic chalice and host. No notes or comments.'

George Tyrrell's Will (Extract).

Of your Charity
Pray for the soul of
George Tyrrell
Catholic Priest, who died
July 15, 1909. Aged 48 years.
Fortified by the Rites
of the Church.
R.I.P.

Inscription on Tyrrell's tombstone in Storrington Churchyard.

'*I am glad God is to judge me and not any of his servants.*'

Last words of Tyrrell's last letter to the writer of this paper.

I WAS spending part of the summer of last year, August, 1932, in the neighbourhood of Worthing, and one lovely, hot day, finding myself alone and free, I wandered off to revisit the scene of George Tyrrell's death and the grave in which he lies buried. The grave itself is carefully tended, and I was glad to see that Arthur Bell lies beside him, and, close by, Alfred Fawkes, a very real and devoted friend.

How well I remembered that funeral, twenty-three years ago. How peaceful the place looks now, and who would guess, reading the inscription on the head-stone, that all was not peace when we laid him there. A Catholic Priest, fortified by the Rites of the Church. And yet I can imagine that a stranger, reading that inscription, might be somewhat mystified by it. A Catholic Priest, fortified by the Rites of the Church, and the Catholic Church and Churchyard just the other side of the adjacent wall! Why does he lie in an alien cemetery? Why indeed? Perhaps I may be allowed just to recall the bare outlines of the story for the sake of readers who may never have heard it.

George Tyrrell was a Jesuit priest who took a leading part in the attempt to face, and find an answer to, modern religious difficulties (which later on was called the Modernist movement) in the Roman Catholic Church in the first decade of this century. In February, 1906, his Order dismissed him, having traced the authorship of *A Letter to a Professor* to him. He had

previously himself petitioned to be released from his vows as a member of the Order.[1] It is customary when a priest is dismissed from an Order, for the Order itself to provide him with a bishop, unless, of course, there are grave moral charges against him. If a priest leaves at his own request, he seeks a bishop himself. A priest cannot say Mass without a *celebret*, *i.e.* papers given him by a bishop, who is responsible for him. Tyrrell fell between two stools. The Order dismissed him, but fell back on the fact that he had himself previously requested to be relieved in order to justify its neglect to provide him with a bishop. Tyrrell could not find a bishop for himself as he had been dismissed. Hence he was left in an unfrocked condition, open to any construction, friendly or unfriendly. Not a very creditable proceeding, perhaps, on the part of the authorities, but war is war, and they scented a possible future opponent.[2] It had already been determined to crush the Modernist movement. These matters were carried through at the headquarters of the Order in Rome. In view of future events, Tyrrell was, later on, inclined to consider this action of their providential, as far as he was concerned. He could still receive the Sacraments as a layman, but he could not say Mass.

Then in September, 1907, the Encyclical *Pascendi* was published. It condemned Modernism, root and branch, religious and irreligious alike, re-stated Catholic doctrine in terms of medieval philosophy and theology, ignored all modern religious difficulties, and imposed humiliating penalties on all theological students who showed signs of any independence of thought. But that was not the worst part of it to those at whom it was aimed. In the eyes of many devout Catholics it seemed to attack the life of the Spirit, to deny, or at least to overlook, the action of God in each individual soul, the freedom of the individual conscience, and to replace the voice of God and Christ in the soul by that of the Pope, who thus became, as it were, the *fons et origo* of our faith. To startled Modernists, and many non-Modernists as well, it appeared to teach blank materialism. *That* was the scandal given

[1] He had long felt that he and the Order were moving in opposite directions.

[2] By refusing the celebret a priest may be starved into submission and silence.

by the Encyclical *Pascendi*. The present writer well remembers the consternation with which it was received by most educated and nearly all learned Catholics.

Tyrrell sprang to arms. 'It is ill gibing at the conscience and Holy Ghost,' he wrote; 'who falls on that stone shall be broken.' 'It isn't so much the Modernism that they condemn that one stands for, as the Catholicism that they imply that revolts one.'[3] His letters show that his unfrocked condition gave him, in his opinion, the right to speak his mind. He was the man to do it. 'None so free as I,' he wrote. Technically the publication of his letters of protest against the Encyclical in the *Times* was an act of insubordination for which any priest who had, so to speak, accepted a commission in the Papal army would have been suspended; but Tyrrell was already suspended. He had been dismissed the army. He was also far better qualified for the task of making a protest than any layman could possibly have been. Many of his friends, both Modernist and non-Modernist, while sharing his views on the Encyclical, were dubious as to the wisdom of a protest. They feared scandal, and they also feared censure. 'Say nothing and it will all be forgotten,' they said. 'It will never be forgotten,' wrote Tyrrell. He still believed that we can sin by silence,[4] and there can be no doubt as to the purity of his motives and the genuineness of his horror and indignation at the Encyclical. Rome replied to his protest by a sentence of excommunication, October, 1907.

Tyrrell spent the remaining twenty-one months of his life in writing in defence of religion and in endeavouring to prepare the way for the Christianity of the future. When Cardinal Mercier published a lengthy and bitter attack upon him, Tyrrell, though not blind to the circumstances that made the attack hardly what we in England call 'cricket,' welcomed the opportunity it gave him for 'displaying my wares.' *Medievalism* is far more than a reply to Mercier. That he was sanguine as to the results of his own efforts is more than doubtful.

But the suffering entailed by his position was too great for a man of his sensitive nature. 'Who can dwell in everlasting

[3] I quote his letters. Tyrrell's exact words run: 'It is not so much that one stands for the Modernism it condemns as that one revolts from the Catholicism it implies.'

[4] Proplis suri non tacebo, he wrote.

burnings?' His health broke down, and after a grave but unheeded warning in the spring of 1909, the end came almost suddenly in the following July.

The news of George Tyrrell's dangerous illness brought several of his more intimate friends to Storrington, amongst others Miss Norah Shelley, at whose parents' house in Clapham he had often spent weeks at a time, and the present writer. Miss Shelley came on Saturday, July 10, and she took a room in the inn opposite to Mulberry House, where Miss Petre and her widowed sister were then living. July 10 was the day on which Dr. Dessoulavy visited Fr. Tyrrell at the request of Baron von Hügel and Miss Petre. Fr. Tyrrell was better that day and hopes of his recovery were entertained. Miss Petre told Miss Shelley that he had even asked after the dogs.

Next day, Sunday, July 11, Miss Shelley paid him a little visit. She found him perfectly conscious. His speech was somewhat indistinct, but she understood everything that he said. He was unequal to any sustained conversation, but he made several remarks and, as usual, teased her a little, affectionately. He was quite his old self. But he was not as well as he had been the day before, and next morning, July 12, he had a severe relapse, a recurrence of the cerebral haemorrhage. He became quite unconscious and paralysed down one side. Miss Petre sent for the Prior of Storrington Monastery, who was also the Roman Catholic parish priest. He declared later, in a letter to the Tablet, that he found a perfectly unconscious and dying man, and therefore he gave him the benefit of the doubt as to his willingness to submit and anointed him. There were present Miss Petre and Miss Shelley. The Prior and Miss Shelley both afterwards declared solemnly that George Tyrrell gave not the slightest sign of consciousness during the whole ceremony.[5] Miss Petre thinks that consciousness returned, because he raised a hand while being anointed, though she agrees that he was unconscious when the Prior arrived. Mrs. Grimston, one of his two nurses, says that she went in to him directly after the ceremony and found him quite unconscious and paralysed down one side.

[5] In fact, the Prior left, promising to return about 1 p.m. *in case* Fr. Tyrrell should by then have recovered consciousness.

I reached Storrington some hours after the Prior's visit. I asked to see George Tyrrell, and while I was at lunch at the inn with Baron von Hügel and Dr. Dessoulavy[6] (who had arrived in response to a wire, but who did not again visit the patient), word came from Miss Petre that I could do so. I went across at once, through the house and garden to the annexe where Fr. Tyrrell had a sitting-room and a tiny bedroom. I found him tossing restlessly and apparently partly conscious. Miss Petre spoke my name very distinctly, and he turned and pressed my hand with his right one. He did not attempt to speak, so that I cannot be sure that he knew me, and I soon slipped away as I seemed to be disturbing him. I stayed with Mrs. Tyrrell (now Lady Tyrrell) until after George Tyrrell's death. I saw him several times on the two succeeding days (he died on July 15), as I followed Mrs. Tyrrell when she went into his room. I never again detected the faintest sign of consciousness, though I watched him closely for longish periods of time. I noticed, however, the total paralysis of his left hand and arm and the constant muscular movement of the right hand and arm —up, out, drop, over and over again. I came to the conclusion later on, when I read the account in the 'Life,' that the raising of the hand during the anointing was automatic, and betokened unconsciousness rather than consciousness. However, I do not see that the matter is of any great importance, as flickers of consciousness are, I am informed, common in the last stage of his disease (Bright's), and certainly cannot be interpreted as cancelling fixed decisions arrived at in full health and strength and adhered to during life, as exemplified in his will.

The question of supreme interest in this matter is: did Fr. Tyrrell change his mind on his death-bed? This question has nothing to do with the further question whether he valued the Sacraments. No one who knew George Tyrrell would believe for a moment that he would have refused the Sacraments had there been no conditions attached to their reception. What we want to know is: did he submit? Did he accept what he calls in

[6] Dr. Dessoulavy was attached to the Xaverian College for Boys at Mayfield. He must have been highly esteemed by the Baron or the latter would not have appealed to him. I see no reason to withhold his name as, if my interpretation is accepted, his conduct was perfectly correct and in no way open to criticism. So at least I gather from other priests.

his will 'the Vatican heresies' and abandon what he had called 'Catholic principles' in order to obtain the Sacraments? Did his courage fail him at the last, and did he find himself unable to face death unfortified by those Sacraments that he had been able to live without? To find any answer at all to these questions we must turn to the visit of Dr. Dessoulavy.

No one has ever suggested that Tyrrell asked for any priest, either before Dr. Dessoulavy's visit or later, when nothing came of that visit. Whatever we may think of Miss Petre's action during Tyrrell's last illness, and however much some of us may think that she misinterpreted his mind, we must admit that, as an orthodox Catholic, she did the right thing. She sent for a priest and she left that priest alone with Fr. Tyrrell.[7] Having done this, her responsibility ended. All further action lay with the priest, who, by consenting to come, had taken charge of the case. He was a learned man; he knew Tyrrell; and presumably he had the Church's laws at his finger ends, and so, for the matter of that, had Tyrrell. Both priests were excellent theologians and canonists, and both knew perfectly well that an excommunicated man cannot be 'reconciled,' *i.e.* cannot receive the Sacraments, unless he 'submits.' This submission is an easy matter if the patient is conscious, even though he may be indistinct in his speech or even speechless. Tyrrell's consciousness during Dr. Dessoulavy's visit has never been questioned. To his friends that playful 'He's as bad as I am' showed a humorous appreciation of the situation only possible if Tyrrell was completely himself. Perhaps nothing conveyed to the present writer more comforting assurance of Tyrrell's peace of mind on his death-bed than that tendency to poke fun at his visitors. It is really a matter of no particular importance whether or no Dr. Dessoulavy understood what Tyrrell was trying to say. This priest had one duty to perform and one only, and that was to find out Tyrrell's state of mind. Was he or was he not ready to submit? Failing power of speech on the part of the patient, he had only to take his hand and ask him to press his in token that he submitted to the Pope and accepted *Pascendi*, and if Tyrrell had given ever so slight a pressure the deed

[7] She took care to select a priest who would 'play fair' and not attempt to coerce the sick man.

would have been done. No more questions would have been asked. Dr. Dessoulavy would have given him absolution on the spot,[8] and would have been in duty bound to take the next train to London to inform the bishop, who might have come in person to administer the Sacrament, so great would have been his joy, and the offices of the Catholic papers might have run out of printer's ink with their columns of ecstatic expressions of delight at the return of such a prodigal.

But what really happened? No one, not even Miss Petre herself, seems to be quite sure. She appears to have taken for granted that Dessoulavy gave him absolution because she never seems to have realized that anything but Tyrrell's own desires stood between him and the Sacraments. To a looker-on like the present writer, Dessoulavy's action appears to be conclusive. He washes his hands of the whole affair, goes home, and makes not the slightest attempt to negotiate with the bishop, who alone had power to authorize the administration of the Sacraments. In fact, he does precisely what any other priest would have done had he found an excommunicated patient determined to die as he had lived.

There we must leave the matter. Later on, before giving leave for Roman Catholic burial, the Bishop of the diocese (Southwark) demanded from the Abbé Brémond proof that Tyrrell had submitted, which was asking the impossible. Brémond arrived on the scene far too late to have been able to obtain any sort of recantation from Tyrrell. The bishop knew of Dessoulavy's visit. Why did he not apply to him, and grant or withhold permission according to his report? He was the only priest who ever saw Tyrrell when he was still conscious.

Miss Petre was perfectly right when she pleaded that her mistakes, if any, should not be visited on Tyrrell. She was a devoted friend of the dying man, willing to risk any censure for herself if only she could procure for him the last consolations of religion. Surely a very forgiveable mistake, if mistake it was, and one which, from the point of view of the authorities, ought to have appeared both edifying in itself and gratifying to themselves. And after all, what difference did her action make? It

[8] That is, if he considered Tyrrell to be in immediate danger; otherwise he would have had to obtain faculties from the bishop.

was the priests, not she, who were responsible. Why have they confused the issues in a really perfectly simple case? Why do some of them try to say that Tyrrell would have submitted if he had not been prevented? Who prevented him? Who could have prevented him unless it was the priest who offered him his services, Dr. Dessoulavy himself? Surely a rather unthinkable proposition.

Tyrrell was denied Christian burial by the Roman Catholic Church, in spite of the charitable ministrations of the Prior over his unconscious form, because the authorities had a very accurate notion of the upshot of his interview with Dr. Dessoulavy. Dessoulavy was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Southwark, who had a right to demand information from him, and who doubtless did so and obtained it.

As his own Church rejected his dead body, the Rector of Storrington, with the utmost sympathy and Christian charity, offered the hospitality of his own churchyard. The Abbé Brémond, acting as a friend and in no way in his priestly capacity, led the little procession to the grave and recited the prayers.

And so perhaps now the stranger will understand why that wall separates the grave of a Catholic priest, who died fortified by the rites of his Church, from the adjacent Roman Catholic church and burial ground.

As the present writer stood by that grave and recalled to mind those long-past events in which she played, it is true, but a very insignificant part, she found herself wondering vaguely whether the sound of the monastery Mass-bell ever reached as far as the grave. Somehow, foolishly perhaps, it pleased her to think that his body lies within hearing of it. For which of us, his devoted friends, were ignorant of his passionate love of the Mass and the desperate pain that his deprivation brought him? Surely his martyrdom will bear fruit, and in days to come the fact that he now lies with a wall between him and the Church that he loved to the end may prove a potent factor in the levelling of all the walls that now divide those for whom Christ prayed 'That they all may be one: as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee.'

K. M. Clutton.

MODERNISM AND ITS FUTURE

II. CHRIST UNIVERSAL.

By the Rev. Alfred Darby, M.A., B.D., F.Ph.S.

TO assume, as Modernism does, that the pronouncements of authority transmitted by traditionalism are not of a nature to forbid their re-examination is to make universal reason the final judge of the truth upon which the human mind can safely rely. It is upon the possibility of giving to Christianity such a universal form of presentation that the salvation of the world depends. A gospel that is to be accepted by all must be of a character that all can understand in one way and follow out in consciously directed endeavour. Passive acquiescence in supposedly supernatural operation cannot bring the world to the righteousness it needs, for this righteousness is the fruit of right exercise of responsible moral judgment. If Jesus Christ is truly what Christianity affirms that He is, the Saviour of the world, it must be because He provides something which has the requisite universal quality; what He can do for one, He can do for any or for all.

So far as men can discern, the divine plan is but gradually worked out to fulfilment. The Church is still in the making, and must live in the hope that the kingdom of this world will become the Kingdom of God and of His Christ. A Church which makes salvation depend upon the conjectural condemns itself to become the Church of a small and dwindling minority; it puts the emphasis upon things concerning which mankind can never be brought to one mind, for there is no authority powerful enough to enforce acceptance of one body of conjectures to the exclusion of all others. That authority can do this is the cherished dream of Catholicism, but the only way to a universal Church is through teaching that is based upon universals.

Christianity is primarily discipleship of Jesus Christ, and not acceptance of a supernaturalist economy of redemption independent of purposive moral life. It took its rise in acceptance of Jesus as the long-awaited Messiah of God, one to be obeyed and followed whenever He might appear, but this acceptance

was itself the outcome of experience of His life and teaching and of the appeal He made to the moral conscience of His hearers; conviction of the truth of His revelation is still the final reason why men acknowledge Him as their Lord.

Conjecture regarding Christ's personality and His relation to the Father soon became active, with the ultimate result that much is now taught, even as of first importance, which it is impossible to display as bearing His approval, or even as ever having been present in His mind, and this conjectural element, for those who desire to follow Him, must be deemed of subordinate importance, even if it is thought to be sufficiently reliable. The sincere disciple of Jesus will want to know, not what the Church has excogitated since His day, but what his chosen Master unquestionably taught, for it is this that he will wish to weave into his own life. When he applies himself to learn this he will discover, first, that the teaching of the Lord requires no supplementing by fallible human tradition; and secondly, that the Church, mainly owing to its attempts to improve upon His simple and gracious gospel, has wandered far from Him.

Modernism, then, aims to discover and define what can be given such reasonable form that all can understand and act upon it with constant endeavour and intelligent apprehension of the end to be attained. Such an aim implies recognition of the kinetic character of mental and moral judgment and sympathy with the advance that this involves; modernism therefore does not deceive itself with the fantasy that it can reach finality, and it desires to keep open the way to a progressive life. Traditionalism, on the other hand, is acceptance of a static condition as essential to religion. This is contrary to the mind of the modern world, which can hardly envisage itself otherwise than as undergoing perpetual change and is accustomed to see old-established traditions overthrown by advancing knowledge. The unchangeable character in which Catholicism takes so much pride is not a virtue, but presage of its ultimate dissolution.

Modernism is not a general philosophy of life which omits all reference to religion; it is specifically an interpretation of Christianity. If it confines itself to experience it must rely upon what was actually presented to the world in Jesus Christ, but it still does not altogether avoid the conjectural. It accepts, and is

governed by, belief in the existence of God, the creator and governor of all that is, and in man's responsibility to Him. This must always be a venture of faith, and its opposite, which is also a conjecture, is that no such transcendent being exists, that the mystery of the universe is due to ignorance, and not to its being the creative work of a God who does not come within the range of perception. Of the possible alternative conjectures man must choose one.

It is probable that the majority of men believe in the existence of God, but they do not all attach the same meaning to the name; while they are influenced by the belief that they are subject to an unseen transcendent power, and agree that if God exists He is the governor of all things in heaven and earth, they are given to the fashioning of definitions which have the inevitable effect of making Him less than God, or at least they conceive of Him in ways that have this consequence. In Christianity especially anthropomorphism is carried to an extreme point. God is spoken of in terms of the human spirit or consciousness, and some persuade themselves that they thus, in some degree, escape the anthropomorphism; but it is clear that consciousness or spirit, as known, is altogether inadequate to the expression of transcendent being, and at the best can furnish but a faint analogue. The result of such definition must be to bring down the conception of the transcendent God to the level of the mind that frames it, and to convey into that conception the very limitations of consciousness which lead to the positing of a transcendent. It is easier to trust in a God acknowledged to be One who controls the universe and directs its course in ways altogether beyond understanding, than it is to trust in One conceived to be such that man can judge Him by his own feeble and limited standards. Much religious distress, and much unbelief, are the direct outcome of this propensity to definition, and there is no sufficient realization that if man makes God in his own image, he must necessarily create perplexities for himself. Belief in God is actually more effective when the sense of His transcendent majesty is retained unimpaired than it is when definition which detracts from His transcendency is indulged in. Man must express his relation to God in terms of his own nature, but these cannot express the relation of the transcendent reality to him.

An essential condition of human progress is social life, and every society requires of its members submission to restraints upon their individual freedom of action for the good of the general body. Every society develops a moral code or standard of behaviour which is enforced upon the members by positive enactment and by common agreement regarding what conduct is to be encouraged and what is not. Hence arises the habit of moral judgment of action and the sense of responsibility to an external moral demand; those activities are considered lawful which do not conflict with the code accepted as regulating the common life. These regulative codes or standards vary from one community to another and are among the factors which tend to preserve their separate existence. The incidence of the moral demand becomes wider and more detailed as civilization advances, and moral judgment must therefore be kinetic. The moral problems arising are ever changing and the capacity for adjustment must be preserved; when a society loses this capacity and becomes stationary it is on the way to decay. Traditionalism, in its resistance to change, is opposed to that free exercise of thought which is necessary to this progressive adjustment and to right response to ever-changing circumstances.

In order that the confusion which now characterizes the thought and moral life of the world may give place to the unity that all who care for human welfare must desire, two things are necessary. These are a universally accepted principle of truth and a universally accepted principle of right, and these must be such that they can be understood and acted upon by all. These principles cannot be isolated the one from the other, for right thought is necessary to action which is right, not only in motive, but also in its effects, and successful pursuit of the great ideals of truth and goodness depends upon the validity of the principles that determine its direction. The value of religions is to be determined by the measure of their conducement to this great end, and if they put obstacles in the way of its pursuit they are positively harmful. A traditionalism that emphasizes the conjectural, which cannot be verified or held firm in conception by appeal to experience, cannot supply the vital needs of humanity; it distracts from the pursuit to which all are necessarily committed, and hinders recognition that the forces of social life are

driving mankind on to ever better realization of its latent ideals.

A prominent conception of the New Testament is that of Christ as the light of the world, the light that lighteneth every man coming into the world. This is to claim for Him the power to supply the needs of humanity. If the claims of Christianity are to be upheld, the way Christ manifested must be proved to be the way to truth and righteousness that the world must seek. Is this 'light' to be rightly explained otherwise than by reference to the distinction we have drawn between knowledge and conjecture? To a world confused by a multitude of cults and religions, all alike resting upon conjecture and many of them handed down from a distant past, was presented the revelation of Jesus in its simplicity, reasonableness and power. For the darkness of uncertain conjecture and unverifiable supernaturalism He substituted the light which consists in clear understanding of what life rightly lived must be. To the disciples of Jesus came the conviction that they had set their feet upon a way which, while to them it seemed to be what they sought, a way of life well-pleasing to God, was also one to call into full exercise powers they enjoyed. The proof of its truth they found in actual achievement of a righteousness impossible to them until their capacities were illuminated by the light Christ shed. They looked upon their new powers as the gift of God in the manifested Christ, but there can be no doubt of their joy in the exercise of these powers, and this exercise was personal endeavour in accordance with realised conceptions, an energizing of real moral value, not mere submission to the requirements of a supersystem. The light is provided by Jesus Christ; the disciple must walk in it if it is to be light for him.

It is not the later teaching of the organized Church, but the personal teaching of the Lord, borne witness to by the Apostles who went in and out with Him, which produced in the first Christians their sense of fellowship and their joy in their faith, the temper which the Church has never since been able to recover. They received what was directly presented to them in the human life of Jesus of Nazareth, and were not at all influenced by theological doctrines formulated much later in an atmosphere of contention and owing much to Platonic realism. If Christianity is again to display itself as the great hope of the

world it must free the personality of Jesus from the theological garments in which it has shrouded Him. It has used His name to sanction so much that cannot justly be ascribed to Him that the appeal of His personality has been greatly weakened. He founded no Church of the kind now sometimes asserted to be the only channel of divine grace; He asked for no acceptance of statements of doctrine regarding things transcendent or His relation to the Father; but assuming, as He justly might, that His hearers held the Jewish faith in one only and holy God, He went on to show how they might share in the divine holiness.

Neither did the Lord give His disciples any information regarding the conditions of the life He encouraged them to hope for. He called upon them to follow Him, and in His companionship they learnt what they were convinced was the way to God, the words of eternal life. With this reticence on the part of Christ we may put in contrast the many conjectures which have been framed to satisfy what is perhaps a natural and justifiable curiosity. Not even can it be said that the Lord taught much that was new, for almost all His teaching was drawn from the Jewish scriptures and much of it is to be found in the books of other religions. His revelation was a revelation of what a capacity that His hearers possessed could do if fully developed and made the fundamental principle of life, and it was His unflinching fulfilment of the requirements of this principle in His own person which made Him the founder of a great religion. The hope of Christianity to-day is bound up with the possibility of making that revelation the power it was when He set it forth, and its urgent call to the world now is not primarily a call to belief in mystic doctrines, but to acceptance of a way of life presented in experience for all the world to see, to evaluate and come to a moral decision upon. It is experience and trial of this way of life which alone justifies the further venture of faith that in Jesus Christ the mind of God was made manifest. The foundations of Christianity, then, are laid in experience, and the final judgment of men will be decided by the response they make to a moral demand which is, or can be made, intelligible to all. Every man bears in his nature the capacity of right response to this demand, and Christ is judge of all men because all possess the capacity to which He appealed.

What was the principle that our Lord set forth and claimed to exemplify in such a way that He could say 'I am the way, the truth, and the life'? This is the message that Christianity has it in charge to deliver and to make manifest in its life, and it is a message which, for the modern world, must be substantiated by something firmer than sentimental and pietist assertions of personal conviction or by reiteration of pronouncements of authority. Christianity must literally demonstrate that in Jesus Christ is to be found the foundation for efforts directed towards bringing the human race to a firm unity. It does not seem possible to evade this issue, and Christianity cannot fulfil this requirement otherwise than through experience and appeal to universals; conjecture cannot do it. If the Church is to develop into a universal Kingdom of Christ, it must make its life an emphatic manifestation of the value of the principle it holds. The mind of Christ must appear in all its activities, and no authority must be allowed to usurp His prerogatives or to substitute another gospel for His.

While the New Testament remains the chief witness for the teaching of Jesus, there can be but one possible answer to the question propounded above. The burden of the whole book is the need of that acceptance of Christ which issues in endeavours to follow in His steps. The way of Christ is the way of love, and saving faith is acceptance of the principle of love as the final determinant of righteousness. Nineteen centuries have passed since Jesus Christ forced this conviction upon mankind, and there is nothing visible that could take its place or do its work, nor anything else in the records of His life that could justify man's estimate of Him. All moral failure is failure rightly to apply the principle of love, whether it be on the part of individuals, of communities or of churches, and the world discusses possible alternatives only because Christianity does not exhibit the fruitfulness of the principle in a convincing manner. A common cause of failure has been emphasis upon things conjectural concerning which the Master, in His loyalty to truth, was silent: it is this which has brought about the divisions and contentions of the Churches and the perpetual breach of the unity which love love and simple loyalty to the Lord, if allowed to prevail, would produce.

Love, as the Christian should understand it, is the attitude and energizing of the personality when it seeks to find itself in whatever is presented; desires that all creatures, as far as is consistent with due regard to others, shall attain to the full measure of their capacity, and works perseveringly to this end. Its foundation is the universal instinct of tender feeling, and it is the raising of this instinct to its highest point of sublimation. It knows not envy nor jealousy, but is content to see its ends brought about by any. It is the way to the perfecting of social life because implying that complete adjustment of individuals to one another, and to the society as a whole, which is the ideal of such life.

However feeble the actual display of love may be, there is little need to stress the point that, in the domain of moral activity, love rightly understood is the final principle of righteousness. Sympathy, patience, justice, reverence, sacrifice, all that is summed up in the commandment 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' is what mankind everywhere needs to practise and to have dealt out to it. Every man of goodwill will acknowledge this when he realizes the full scope of the principle. It is lack of understanding of what Christian love means, and confusion of it with partial and inferior manifestations designated by the same name, which leads to a search for something broader and deeper. The dictum of St. Paul still stands as the final word regarding moral activity, 'Love is the fulfilling of the law.'

What is by no means so well seen is the incidence of love upon the mental life, its value as a guide to truth, both to truth considered in the New Testament way as rightness of life, and also to truth in the broader sense of right mental response to what is presented in experience. The chief obstacle to human progress and the source of many grave ills is the unreceptive attitude of the majority of men towards what is new or contrary to what they have come to accept. This may be inevitable, but it is none the less incompatible with love, which is the very spirit of receptivity, and is eager to know, and know rightly, in order that the service in which it delights may be more efficiently performed. The sensitiveness of love makes it quick to discern the evils arising from false opinions or from absence of knowledge, and it is also the negation of that exercise of self-assertion to

which so much conjecture has been due. There is urgent need in the world for the fearless honesty which will pursue a thought to its full conclusion, and can gladly see a cherished opinion overthrown by a better. Such exercise of love can hardly find scope while traditionalism holds its ground and fortifies its position by assertions of divine inspiration and threats of the ill consequences of rejection.

The revelation of Jesus Christ to the world was the revelation of the supremacy of love as the way to righteousness, and He was sustained throughout by His conviction that He was loyal to the will of the Father. In this conviction He taught that through the energizing of love the disciple brought himself into harmony with the energizing of God, and He has made it impossible for His disciples to think of God otherwise than in terms of Himself; they must, as moral creatures, believe that God is holy, ,and for disciples of Jesus holiness is the fruit of activity of love.

Since love is the expression of a manner of energizing, it is not rendered nugatory by ignorance of God's essential nature, whatever that nature may be; He can still, as beneficent in His attitude, be the object of human trust. While the individual retains his individuality and must meet his experience from that standpoint, he can attain to nothing higher than harmony of motive and activity with that of Christ and of God, and the manner of his energizing is the final determinant of the value of his personality. For anything beyond this he must resort to the conjectural and problematical. Peace of soul arises from the conviction that the life lived is, in impulse at least, in harmony with the energizing of God, and this must also mean harmony with the laws of the universe which is of His ordering. This conviction is the fruit of acceptance of Jesus as Lord.

The great work of Christ did not end with the enunciation of a principle; He retains his pre-eminence, and is still He whom men most reverence, because He embodied that principle so fully in His own life and personality. No code could be framed which would adequately meet the moral needs of mankind as the ages pass and conditions of life change. The need is for something simpler and more consonant with the nature of human personality than a code could ever be, and the disciple turns for

guidance, not to commandments laid down which can never be sufficient, but to the person of the Lord who displayed the fine fruits arising from thorough application of the principle He proclaimed. Humanity at its wisest, as also at its simplest, can look directly upon the Lord and see the impulse of His heart and the moving spirit of His life, and walking in the light so gained, can follow Him with confident steps. When the disciple has gained His spirit and temper, and looks out upon the world with His eyes, he can act as He would do, and is truly His. Whether he has gained His spirit or not he can decide for himself, for he can know beyond question whether he is energizing in the Christ manner. The fruits of the spirit are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, and the world will be the more blessed when these things are more prevalent in it; they prevail only when men's activities are characterized by these qualities. The faithful disciple cannot hope to exhibit anything better, or to offer to God or to Jesus Christ a fairer worship.

In nothing has the tendency to supernaturalism been more hurtful than in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. As in other cases, what is mysterious and beyond reason is thought to be of higher value than anything more consonant with human capacity, and it has come to pass that the Church has largely lost the consciousness that the promised guide into truth is the *known* spirit of Jesus, not some mystic power so remote from actual experience that neither its presence nor its activity can be identified. The natural consequence is that many, while proclaiming different views, claim to be guided by the spirit of truth, and none can furnish evidence that his is a just claim. That those who are led by the spirit of Christ attain to holiness of life is a fact of experience, and since the final aim of Christianity is to produce this holiness, there is no need to search beyond the one and only thing that can produce it. The spirit of Christ is the spirit of love, and He lived and wrought in the faith that it was also the spirit of God. This is the crowning point of His revelation, and it furnishes what man most needs. It is because this is a possible possession of every man that Jesus Christ is the Saviour and Lord of the world. Those who are led by the spirit of Christ are His as they can be in no other way,

and this is the truth that must be held at all hazards, the truth that makes man free. When the world, as perhaps some day it will, seriously sets itself to find an effective principle of righteousness, one which all can follow with clear insight, it will find it in the expression of St. Paul, 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.' This is the great and simple end to which Modernism will come and the extreme point to which experience and reason can carry it. Beyond this is conjecture which must change as the materials change that imagination employs. The spirit of love is the great principle of life, and it abides through all advance and change in knowledge of the universe, and must determine the use made of whatever man may learn. The work before Modernism is to bring men back to realization of the Kingship of Jesus Christ and to make Him the rallying-point for all humanity, and in order to do this it must emphasize what He actually revealed.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE DE POTENTIA*

The *Quaestio Disputata* as a literary form was the perfected result of a very gradual development. The twelfth century teacher of theology was primarily a reader. When manuscripts were still scarce it was his business to read the text he used, whether the Sacred Scriptures themselves or one of the books of Sentences which were the earliest manuals of theology. But his duty was not, of course, exhausted in reading the text. He also commented upon it and answered such questions as any of his pupils might put on points of difficulty. With the general adoption in the schools of the four books of Sentences of Peter Lombard as the recognized manual of theology there came a noteworthy division of labour. The bachelor in theology was required to comment systematically upon the Sentences, while the master, among his other duties, proposed at regular intervals a subject for discussion. The set subject always took the form of a question to which affirmative or negative answers, based either upon some sufficient authority or on grounds of reason, were given. The master then summed up the discussion by his own authoritative resolution of the difficulty. Finally, he drew up in literary form the official protocol of the debate and submitted it to his class on the following or some subsequent day.

In his early years at Paris, St. Thomas 'disputed' as often as twice a week; in his later years, as a teacher at Rome, Viterbo and Anagni, and on his return to Paris, once a fortnight. His 'disputed questions' number altogether 510, and comprise seven groups of subjects, *De Veritate, De Potentiâ, De Malo, De Unime Verbi Incarnati, De Spiritualibus Creaturis,*

* *The De Potentiâ of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Translation by the English Dominican Fathers, Vol. I). (Burns, Oates and Washbourne: 1932. 7/6.)

De Animâ, and *De Virtutibus*. In their literary form, as in the *Summa*, Question is the technical name for a group of questions as actually disputed, each of which is called an Article. Thus the *De Potentiâ* consists of 83 Articles grouped under ten Questions. It is of the first three of these Questions, comprising 32 Articles, that the present volume is a translation.

In so far as the subjects treated in the *Summa* and the *Disputed Questions* are the same, a careful study of the latter is all-important for a full understanding of the former. In the *Questions* the objections raised are as a rule far more numerous and exhaustive, and, as happens in the *Summa* also, it is often in the answers to objections that the fullest light is thrown upon the exact bearing of St. Thomas's main position. But no reader of either one or the other can fail to benefit by the discipline in exact thinking which they afford.

Of the three Questions comprised in this volume, the first deals with the power of God in general, the second with His generative power, the third with His creative power. There is, indeed, a certain amount of overlapping, as for instance in the thirteenth Article of the third Question, which deals with the eternal generation of the Son. But it is just this opportunity of return upon a subject already treated, as considered from a different angle, that makes the 'disputed question' so rich and flexible an instrument of teaching. It enables a great teacher like St. Thomas to rub in, as it were, his points in ever new connections, as incidental illustrations of what happens to be his main subject of the moment. Thus, in contrasting the natural procession of the Son with the Divine Will as the principle of creation, he finds opportunity again and again for marking the exact point of deviation of the Arian heresy. So, too, in his teaching about the necessary co-operation of Divine and natural power, and his parallel vindication of the reality of the formative action of nature, he can point once again the failure of Plato's eternal self-subsistent forms to account for a real world. Or again, he can illustrate the power of matter in disposing the human body to receive its created soul by his favourite theory of the dispositive power of the Sacraments in causing grace.

The English Dominican Fathers were finely inspired to undertake the translation of the two *Summae* and to follow it up with this first section of the *Disputed Questions*. They will be an immense help to the growing number of readers who wish to gain some first-hand acquaintance with the writings of the great Dominican Doctor. None of us can hope to enter fully into the spirit of his teaching without that long and patient study which is probably only to be obtained in anything like sufficient measure in the Roman Schools. But few who attempt to read him seriously will fail to acquire a more real power of exact thinking, and also to appreciate the vast architectonics of any sufficient theology as compared with the jerry-building of most apologetics. To such readers these careful and accurate translations will be of the greatest assistance. They will not dispense with continual resort to the admirable crispness and brevity of the original text; but they will help to a fuller understanding of the more pregnant among its technical terms, especially where these terms recur with differences of meaning which require some modification in an English rendering.

A few errors (no doubt mostly in proof-reading) may be noted. On page 104 (last line but one) 'not' instead of 'and'; page 146 (last paragraph but one), 'the form of the begetter' should read 'the form of the begotten'; page 187 (last paragraph but one), ought not 'what is generated is from another' to read 'is *not* from another'? (Mandonnet's reading

here is 'aliquando non esse,' which is certainly one reply to the third objection. The translator had evidently before him a variant reading which must surely have been 'ab alio non esse,' not 'ab alio esse.') On page 40 (fourth line from the bottom), 'works' is a printer's error for 'words.'

A. L. LILLEY.

A STUDY IN EARLY APOLOGETIC*

The Thirty-second Hartley Lecture is unfortunate in its title. If the reader expect enlightenment upon the Greek Old Testament, he will be sadly disappointed, for the book is a *prolegomena,* rather than a *contribution,* to Septuagintal studies. It is, as the author accurately states in his preface, 'an attempt to present a comprehensive account of the *Letter of Aristeas,* viewed from the threefold standpoint of its historical value, literary character and teaching . . . to indicate its kinship with the Biblical and Apocryphal writings, and to set it in relation to the Hellenistic-Jewish thought of its age.' Upon the undoubted success of this attempt Dr. Meecham is to be congratulated.

The general treatment is sound, if a little conservative. From a short introduction and an English translation of the *Letter* (literal yet not inelegant) we pass to 'Part I, Historical,' which deals with Authorship, Date and Purpose. The pseudonym 'Aristeas' hides an Alexandrian Jew, who although classing himself as a Gentile, yet betrays himself as leaning to Pharisaism. The datings between 200 B.C. (Schürer) and 30 A.D. (Graetz) are valuably discussed and *c.* 100 B.C. (Thackeray, Wendland, Charles and Bickermann) finally selected, being in particular confirmed by certain linguistic phenomena. Owing to the neglect of the Septuagint by the Greeks, it is maintained, and on account of the unpopularity of the Jews, an Apologia was necessary: this need 'Aristeas' met by exalting Jewish life, history and religion, and by attempting to synthesize, though not unreservedly, the wisdom of Jew and Greek, in an effort to promote the political well-being of his people.

The historical value of the *Letter* is next considered, and the literary history of the legend therein embodied. Dr. Meecham's characteristic cautiousness is here most apparent. 'Many scholars,' he says, 'are severe in their judgment of the author's veracity,' and from the severities of H. P. Smith and Gaster alike, he recoils under the aegis of Swete. For him — and for us — 'there is a groundwork of historical fact in "Aristeas,"' confined as it is by the historical nature of the allusions collected; but his belief that the Pentateuch was actually translated under the *patronage* of Philadelphus we feel to be a slight overstatement. However, he admits that the translators were Alexandrian and not Palestinian Jews.

In Part II the literary form and features are treated. 'Aristeas' is an *Epistle,* and a unity (the partition theories of Andrews and Février being rejected) conforming to a well-defined plan with a typical Prologue and Epilogue. The interesting possibility is hinted at that the *Letter* is the second instalment of a series and comparable to Luke-Acts. This section concludes with a discussion — well put together — upon sources: a number of parallels are adduced but nothing really vital emerges.

Part III, headed 'Didactic,' summarises the religious teaching of the *Letter* on God, Man, the Law, Ethical Problems, etc., and compares it with

* *The Oldest Version of the Bible.* By Henry G. Meecham, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. (Holborn Publishing House: 1932. 5/-.)

its predecessors and successors in the same fields. If the remainder of the book is valuable, this part is invaluable, for it is indeed 'Judaism in Brief.'

The book ends with an index of the chief persons named, and four appendices, the one on the Alexandrian-Jewish community being a model of succinct and balanced statement. The footnotes throughout are indicative of the care with which the author sifts the evidence upon which he builds.

If we be at times exasperated by the mass of references in the text (*e.g.* p. 298) and call loudly for more footnotes, if we be inclined to carp at the caution which can spurn the ingenuity of a Février as the perverseness of a Gaster, we nevertheless commend Dr. Meecham's work whole-heartedly as the most helpful in this field which we have read for many a day. We look forward to the promised sequel. H. F. D. SPARKS.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR, OUGHT A CHRISTIAN TO ACCUMULATE RICHES?

May I express my gratitude for the early part of your article on 'Wealth' in the current *Modern Churchman*. It is a subject which, in my opinion, is too often avoided by our spiritual instructors, and under your headings I and II you provide a most interesting and instructive contribution to the Jewish and Christian teaching on the use and abuse of riches.

You say that this age is far from being as materialistic as the age in which Jesus taught. The fact that, as Bacon says, 'Prosperity was the blessing of the Old Testament' (would it not be more correct to say *a* blessing?) makes an important theoretical difference between the Jewish and the nominal Christian's outlook on the subject, but does it make much practical difference? Does the average Christian business man value less the prize of wealth than does the Jew?

But when, Sir, you come to argue both on Christian and economic grounds in favour of individual accumulation of riches, I confess with much regret that I cannot follow you.

It is impossible for me to believe that the same Jesus who said 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven,' would also encourage—even by silence—a young man to make the accumulation of capital his life's work.

Although neither a Communist nor a Socialist, I cannot, so readily as you, assume the necessity of a capitalist constitution of society. But accepting this necessity *pro tem.*, I am much surprised you should appear to think that society is suffering from insufficient accumulation of capital. Political economists tell us that England and civilized countries contain excessive supplies, bursting granaries, idle machinery, on the one hand, but mouths unfed and backs unclad on the other. They say the world crisis is due to want of planning, mal-distribution, failure of co-operation between individuals and nations.

The remedy is more other-seeking service. Is not the commercial collapse largely due to too great haste to be rich on the part of a few? Some accumulation is undoubtedly necessary for civilization, but I cannot agree that it must be individual. Why not by the State, the municipalities, co-operative societies, etc.?

I sincerely hope, Sir, that your indispensable journal will not become the rich man's apologist. Let not Modernists be accused of saying 'Blessed are the rich.'

SIDNEY DAVIES.

Worthing. *Feb.* 24, 1933.

[We thank our correspondent for his courteous criticism.

(1) Whether Jesus would condemn the accumulating of riches by an individual seems to us to depend entirely upon (*a*) the motive of the accumulator, which would determine the use he proposed to make of the riches accumulated, and (*b*) the methods used in accumulating.

(2) The accumulation of riches by the individual does not, as Dr. Davies seems to assume, exclude the accumulation of riches by the State, the municipality, or the co-operative society. It is probably a good thing that all these should accumulate, so that there may be a healthy competition in methods of accumulation and in the use of that which is accumulated.

(3) Our present distressing economic situation is too large a subject to discuss here. It may be due to vast over-expenditure rather than to the over-accumulation of capital. The rapid advance in the mechanization of industry and the immense difficulty of the re-distribution of labour is certainly another cause of our troubles. Improvident increase in population is yet another.

But perhaps the situation is not so distressing as our currency reformers seem to desire it to be. There has never been a time when our poorer classes in this country have been so well-fed, well-clothed, well-nursed, well-educated and even well-housed and with as much recreation as at present. Of course there is great room for improvement, but let us not ignore the progress which is being made.—Ed., *M.C.*]

THE CHURCH'S LITTLE BLACK SHEEP.

Sir,

Many of your readers must have been amused at Canon Streeter's review of the 'Black Girl.' But the laugh is not, I think, all on one side. Canon Streeter makes fun of Shaw for preaching as novelties truths which have long been familiar in 'those intellectual and moral backwaters,' the ancient universities; but are these truths familiar outside the universities, or are they confined to the backwaters? In fact, which is the backwater, and which the main stream?

I had the curiosity to set the following questions to thirty-three young men, aged nineteen to twenty-one years, at a Church of England Training College. All of them described themselves as having been regular attendants at Church of England services; thirteen had attended in addition both Church school and Sunday school; fifteen others had attended either a Church school or a Sunday school:

1. Is the book of Job earlier or later in date than the books of the Prophets? 2. Is St. John's Gospel earlier or later in date than the other three? 3. Is it more, or less, historical?

I asked in addition for the *source of the information* in each case.

Mr. Shaw is taken to task by Canon Streeter for not knowing the answers to these questions. Since Mr. Shaw also thinks that fundamentalist religion is still strong enough to need fighting, I added a fourth question:

4. Where, or by whom, were you first told that all parts of the Bible are not equally sacred and equally true?

Here is the result:

Question.	Answers.			Source of information.					
	Right.	Wrong.	None.	Coll.	Sec'd'y. School.	Church. School.	Counc. School.	Reading or Lect.	Not known.
1.	7	16	11	8	1	–	–	1	12
2.	32	1	–	24	6	1	1	1	–
3.	25	8	–	17	3	1	–	–	12

4. The sources of information were as follows :—

Secondary School, 9. Parents, 5. Vicar, 3. Church School, 2. Sermon, 2. Friends, 2. Council School, 2. Own opinion, 2. Unknown, 2. Brother, 1. Reading, 1. Church Class, 1. College, 1.

It seems that these young men are better informed than Mr. Shaw. But where did they get their information? Apparently, out of the whole thirty-three, who, unlike Mr. Shaw, have regularly attended Churches, Church schools and Sunday schools, two only owed their knowledge of any of these facts (of which two are really important) to sermons, only three to a clergyman (apart from the college staff) and only five others to any Church institution whatsoever. Sunday schools and Bible classes score a complete blank. We are forced to reflect that it is only the bad teacher who blames his pupils for their ignorance; the fault lies with himself. But what should we think of a teacher if we found him caning the one boy who was bright enough and interested enough to try to put things right by a little amateurish work of his own? And should we think the teacher excused if he explained that he had all along known what was right, but had been unwilling or unable to teach it to his class?

But quite apart from sermons and Church teaching, is there anything in our services to show that the Lessons and the Psalms are not all of equal value? Does not even our liturgy preserve for daily use those very ideas which Canon Streeter ridicules Mr. Shaw for attacking on the grounds that they are already dead? Mr. Shaw has never claimed to teach new truths, but only to popularize those that are old. If he is doing this badly, or if his attempt be resented as an encroachment upon clerical prerogatives, the remedy lies not in castigating Mr. Shaw, but in seeing to it that our own teaching is more effective, and our own services less misleading.

R.J.S.

March 6th, 1933.

[Our correspondent's figures have a special significance in view of the present proposals for the closing of some of the Church Training Colleges. The knowledge required to answer questions (2) and (3) was acquired by twenty-four and seventeen young men out of thirty-three in regular association with Churches not until they entered such a Training College and received its religious instruction.—Ed., *M.C.*]